

	PAGE
WAVERLY, petition of Waverly Short Line for permission to condemn additional depot grounds at.....	31
WEDGEWOOD & CO., Storm Lake, v. Ill. Cent., refusal to furnish cars for Minneapolis....	85
WELLS, George Bank, Germanfa, v. B., C. R. & N., overcharge on grain—interstate.....	55
WESLEY, Mrs. E. A. Hollenbeck of, v. C. & N.-W., overcharges on baggage.....	71
WEST BRANCH, J. J. Smith of, v. B., C. R. & N., cow killed.....	68
WESTON, A. A., Victor, v. C. R. I. & P., overcharge in passenger fare.....	66
WESTON, F. E., Carroll, v. C. & N.-W., overcharge on shipment of hay.....	50
WHITLOCK & FIELDS, Ladora, v. C., R. I. & P., refusal to allow cars to go off line.....	82
WHITTEMORE, J. M. Farley of, v. C., M. & St. P., cars for hay shipments.....	44
WICK, S. W. Lee of, v. C. G. W., obstructing street by standing train at Conger.....	80
WILLIAMS, W. H. Wishard of, v. B., C. R. & N., goods damaged in transit.....	57
WILSON, ISAAC, Henderson, v. C., B. & Q., open farm crossing.....	63
WINNEBAGO COUNTY, citizens of, v. B., C. R. & N., petition for union depot near Ledyard.....	38
WINONA & WESTERN RAILWAY, condensed report of.....	219
WISHARD, W. H., Williams, v. B., C. R. & N., goods damaged in transit.....	57
WOODEN BRIDGES REPLACED BY STEEL AND STONE STRUCTURES.....	4

# TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

## Board of Railroad Commissioners

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1899.

---

STATE OF IOWA

---

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

---

DES MOINES:  
F. R. CONAWAY, STATE PRINTER.  
1900.

## RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

STATE OF IOWA,  
BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS }

*To the Honorable Leslie M. Shaw, Governor of the State of Iowa:*

In pursuance of the statutes of this state we herewith submit the following as the twenty-second annual report of the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa.

The work of the commission for this year has been similar in character to that reported for previous years. In some departments, however, the work has been considerably increased, due, to some extent, to the change in the grades, more rapid transit, and the construction of new lines.

### PERMANENT IMPROVEMENTS TO ROADBED IN IOWA.

During the past year the managements of railways within this state have become thoroughly aroused respecting the public necessity of bettering the condition of their railways, and no stronger evidence of the truth and importance of this proposition need be shown than to inspect the trunk lines passing through Iowa. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended by the railway managements within this state during the year just closed in improving and bettering the condition of the roadbeds of nearly all of the through lines. The time is not far distant when a railway with heavy grades, sharp curves, wooden bridges and inferior ties, rails and ballast, must either improve or better its condition or go into the hands of a receiver.

The traffic of Iowa is large enough and of sufficient value to admit, and in fact require, of the railway managements, without an increase of the rate thereon, a good roadbed, so constructed that one locomotive engine can, with reasonable safety at a comparatively high rate of speed, haul at least forty cars loaded to the capacity of twenty tons each from the Missouri river to the Mississippi river.

A good roadbed reduces the number of accidents both to the prop-



erty of the railway companies and to the public, as well as ensures the safety of the passengers and railway employees.

When it is considered that the traffic must bear not only all the expense of construction and operation, as well as all damage and injury occasioned by accidents, it will be readily conceded that under ordinary conditions money expended to lessen the cost of transportation as well as the risk and hazard of operation, is properly expended, and should be encouraged, if not required, of all railway companies.

The topography of this state will in all or nearly all instances admit of the construction of a roadbed at a reasonable cost, without heavy grades or sharp curves.

The roadbed, to a great extent, must finally and ultimately determine and fix the cost of transportation; the better the roadbed the lower the cost of transportation.

It will appear from the reports of the railway companies to this board that this has been a prosperous year for them, and it will also appear that the railway managements have been liberal in the expenditure of their earnings, in the substantial and permanent improvement of the railways within the state, as well as the construction of many miles of new lines therein. And it may be added here that in the construction of the new lines all or nearly all unnecessary grades and curves have been eliminated therefrom, and that in nearly all of the new construction good railway judgment and management have been exhibited and exercised. These new lines are being equipped with the most approved rolling stock, and when in operation will be a great advantage and convenience to the public, and to the traffic of the entire state.

From such information as the commissioners are at present able to obtain there are between 700 and 800 miles of railroad now in process of construction within this state, which will cost, when completed, approximately, \$13,000,000.

#### STATISTICAL TABLES.

In another part of this report will be found a series of statistical tables, compiled with care and at considerable labor, which, it is believed, cover as completely as data furnished by the railway companies will permit, the operation of Iowa railways, both as respects the entire line and apportionment for Iowa.

These tables include the capital stock, funded and unfunded indebtedness, the earnings and operating expenses, taxes, employes and salaries, tonnage, road mileage, train mileage, cost of improvements, description of equipment, with number of cars supplied with

automatic couplers and train brakes, accidents to persons in Iowa, etc., etc.

The board experiences considerable difficulty in obtaining reliable information covering the operation of railroads in Iowa as distinguished from operation of entire lines.

The officials of the through or trunk lines declare, for the most part, their inability to divide their statistics upon state lines. This refers more particularly to earnings, expenses and tonnage. In supplying the information asked for by the board concerning state earnings, expenses, etc. different bases are used by the different railway companies, none of which, of course, can be accurate, and at best can only represent a more or less liberal approximation.

Some of the companies apportion Iowa earnings and expenses on a revenue train mileage basis. That is, taking the number of miles run by trains earning revenue in Iowa as compared with the number of miles run by revenue-earning trains over the entire system, and placing Iowa earnings and expenses in the same relative proportion to entire system earnings and expenses as Iowa train mileage bears to entire train mileage. This method, perhaps, produces the nearest to what the actual amounts would be, yet it must be conceded that conditions are so entirely different in different localities on the same system, that figures produced by this method cannot be taken in any way as actual. For instance, while over one division of a railway it may be comparatively an easy matter for one engine to haul a train of forty or fifty cars with the usual proportion of loaded and empty cars, on another division twenty cars or even less may be the maximum. These conditions obtaining almost universally on the great trunk lines passing through Iowa, it will readily be seen how unreliable such statistics must be.

The other method of apportionment most in vogue is the road mileage basis, which, it is thought, in general is much inferior to the one heretofore named.

There are some companies which seem to report Iowa statistics arbitrarily, calling them apportionments for Iowa, with no evidence of any particular method having been used to arrive at the figures furnished.

However, considering the difficulty of presenting any accurate method or basis for computing Iowa statistics, and conceding the truth of the statements made by the officials of the trunk lines that it is impossible to accurately divide the earnings and expenses of great railway systems on state lines, the commissioners feel that, in the main, the railway companies have made an honest endeavor to



supply the board with state statistics of reasonable accuracy and completeness.

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF EARNINGS AND OPERATING EXPENSES, IOWA,  
INCLUDING MILEAGE AND EARNINGS PER MILE.

YEAR.	Mileage exclud- ing exchange rights.	Earnings.	Expenses.	Net earnings.	Net earnings per mile of road.
1878.....	4,157.15	\$20,714,496.07	\$12,505,950.23	\$ 8,148,545.84	\$1,990.12
1879.....	4,306.04	21,940,700.44	12,904,429.44	8,436,289.02	1,925.88
1880.....	4,977.01	24,837,545.35	13,982,633.77	10,854,911.58	2,181.00
1881.....	5,425.98	28,452,181.91	16,788,404.39	11,663,777.52	2,149.63
1882.....	6,337.43	32,023,966.03	20,512,399.05	11,511,572.98	1,816.44
1883.....	7,014.95	34,433,354.77	22,827,450.50	11,605,904.27	1,654.45
1884.....	7,349.25	35,735,271.85	23,250,916.03	12,484,355.82	1,654.45
1885.....	7,478.43	36,123,587.45	23,093,531.04	13,030,056.41	1,742.34
1886.....	7,564.67	36,093,106.54	22,931,555.10	13,161,551.44	1,739.87
1887.....	7,997.50	37,529,730.62	24,152,990.71	13,376,739.91	1,672.59
1888.....	8,346.31	37,295,586.08	25,297,183.92	10,998,402.16	1,317.75
1889.....	8,349.00	37,136,409.76	25,296,409.76	11,839,999.45	1,430.19
1890.....	8,412.72	41,318,133.69	27,396,283.93	14,021,849.76	1,666.73
1891.....	8,418.16	43,102,399.35	28,639,292.77	14,463,106.58	1,719.15
1892.....	8,407.34	37,405,473.22	25,076,829.00	12,328,645.22	1,466.41
1893.....	8,401.76	45,805,680.51	32,622,594.42	12,383,086.09	1,474.81
1894.....	8,489.88	40,699,679.92	28,020,531.03	12,679,148.89	1,466.56
1895.....	8,486.36	35,835,910.47	24,736,072.45	11,109,838.02	1,309.28
1896.....	8,495.07	41,841,292.55	28,735,652.59	13,105,639.96	1,542.85
1897.....	8,478.63	38,209,503.04	25,336,714.38	12,872,788.66	1,513.54
1898.....	8,484.16	45,945,596.00	29,515,031.67	16,430,564.33	1,901.34
1899.....	8,514.51	48,466,158.44	31,473,771.68	16,992,386.76	1,994.64

\* C, B. & Q. lines not reporting.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF COMPLAINTS.

The questions and matters of controversy arising between the railways and the people at the present time, in nearly all cases, are adjusted upon an amicable and reasonable basis. The public is not demanding and insisting upon any unreasonable requirements of the railways, and the railway companies, upon the other hand, seem, at least, in most cases to exhibit a disposition to make all reasonable and proper compliance with such demands as are made. Where there is a difference which the board is unable to amicably adjust, it seems to be one where both parties are honest in maintaining their positions, and is not the result of passion, prejudice, or a disposition on the part of the railway companies to oppose state regulation.

#### STOPPING THROUGH TRAINS AT SMALL STATIONS.

Complaints have been filed with the board during the year by the citizens of various small towns asking that so-called "fast" or through trains be stopped for taking on and discharging passengers at such towns. In some cases where the train service has seemed inadequate the commission has so notified the railway company, and in all such cases provision has been made for properly taking care of the business. In other instances where train service seemed amply

sufficient for the business offered by the community, the board has declined to make an order requiring the through trains to stop when no discrimination was shown.

Fast through trains are demanded by the public, and the board has not felt warranted in interfering with their management, except in cases where the train service rendered was utterly inadequate to meet the legitimate demands of the patrons at any particular point.

#### HIGHWAY AND FARM CROSSINGS.

There has been within the last year a number of complaints against the railways, occasioned in some cases by the change of grades thereon, where the same crosses the public highway. In some instances before the change of grade, the public crossing would have been considered reasonably safe as a grade crossing. After the change such crossings were hazardous and dangerous. There has been more or less contention on the part of the public authorities having charge of the supervision of public highways, with regard to the meaning and construction to be given the decisions of the supreme court, wherein it is held that a railway company, where it crosses a public highway, should leave such crossing in the same or as good condition as it was before the construction of the railway. It has been claimed in most of the cases, on the part of the public authorities, that the rule laid down by the court requires of and makes it the duty of the railway company to remove any and all obstructions which in anywise prevent the view of approaching trains, whether the same is caused by the natural conditions and topography of the country, or otherwise, and whether the same may be caused by deep cuts and excavations.

The question is an important one and is becoming more so each year, as increased speed and the number of trains render such crossings more hazardous and dangerous. This question should receive the careful, prompt and effective action of the lawmakers, if additional legislation may be found necessary to fully protect the public and railways against this increased hazard and risk. It involves the lives of the traveling public, upon both the railways and the highways, as well as the employees and property of the railway companies.

What has been said about the highway crossings is in many ways applicable to farm crossings at grade. It would seem that a matter of so much importance ought to be settled by means of definite and reasonable legislation, if such legislation does not already exist.



The live stock interests of this state provide and furnish a large and important item of the wealth of the state, as well as the traffic of the railways. It has been estimated that Iowa furnishes about one-fourth of the live stock received at the Union stockyards at Chicago. In any event, it is a large and valuable interest, and we may infer therefrom that farm crossings, to a great extent, are for the use of live stock in passing from one side of the railway to the other throughout the agricultural districts of the state, and that these crossings should be constructed in such a manner that all extra danger and hazard would be eliminated therefrom, so far as possible. This should, however, be upon and along reasonable lines, and it is the opinion of the board that undergrade and overhead crossings should be encouraged and required where the cost thereof would not be unreasonable or the crossings needless, and the strength and safety of the roadbed would not be substantially impaired thereby.

#### JOINT RATES.

Section 2155 of the code is as follows:

In the event that said railway companies fail to establish through joint rates, or fail to establish and charge reasonable rates for such through shipments, it shall be the duty of the board of railway commissioners, upon the application of any person interested, to establish such rates for the shipment of freight and cars over two or more connecting lines of railways in the state; and in the making thereof, and in changing and revising the same, they shall be governed, as nearly as may be, by the provision of the preceding section of this chapter, and shall take into consideration the average of rates charged by such railway companies for shipments within this state for like distances over their respective lines, and rates charged by the railway companies operating such connecting lines for joint interstate shipments for like distances. The rates established by the board shall go into effect within ten days after the same are promulgated, and from and after that time a schedule thereof shall be prime facie evidence in all the courts of this state that the rates therein fixed are just and reasonable for the joint transportation of freight and cars upon the railroads for which such schedules have been fixed.

Under this section, Mr. E. E. Carpenter filed with the board a complaint against the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, Sioux City & Northern, and the Omaha & St. Louis Railway companies, claiming that he was interested and that a demand had been made upon the companies to establish joint rates between Hull and intermediate points on the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railway, and Blanchard, on the Omaha & St. Louis railway, also from Lester and intermediate points on the Sioux City & Northern railway to said town of Blanchard, the same being points within the state of Iowa. The board fixed the 20th day of December, 1898, at Des Moines, for such hearing, and caused notice to be given the railways named in such

complaint, as well as all other lines operated within the state of Iowa, of the time and place of such hearing. Upon the hearing, by consent of parties thereto, said hearing was continued until the 17th day of January, 1899. In the meantime upon the application of Mr. E. E. Carpenter, another continuance was granted, and the board was finally notified by Mr. Carpenter that he requested the same to be indefinitely postponed. On account of the failure of the complainant to appear and further prosecute this hearing, no further action has been taken by the board therein.

No other person, firm, company, or corporation, claiming to be interested has made any application to the board for the establishment of joint rates within this state. From a careful reading of the statute it is the opinion of the board that a schedule of joint rates can only be established upon the application of a person interested.

#### COAL RATES IN IOWA.

The Twenty-seventh General Assembly passed the following concurrent resolution:

WHEREAS, The coal output of Iowa during the past several years has not only not increased, but very materially decreased, while the output from other states has increased.

WHEREAS, The coal companies of other states are, on account of extremely low rates being made by the different railroads entering Iowa, enabled to place their products in Iowa towns at a lower price than Iowa mines can possibly meet, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House, the Senate concurring,* That the railway commissioners be and are hereby requested to investigate whether or not the decreased production of coal in Iowa is in any manner due to the adjustment of freight rates, and whether the same are so fixed as to discriminate in favor of the coal producers of other states, to the disadvantage of coal producers of Iowa, and to ascertain if rates can be so equalized as to relieve any discrimination, if any be found to exist, and take such steps in the premises as deemed best, and make report as provided by law.

In accordance with the foregoing resolution, the board issued notices for hearing, as publicly as possible through the press and by personal notices to mine owners and operators and railway companies. The hearing, which was quite largely attended by those interested in this question, was had on January 17, 1899. A number of witnesses were examined by the board and much testimony introduced bearing upon the matter. On February 16, 1899, the board made its finding, and such finding, together with an abstract of testimony taken at the hearing, will be found in another part of this report, under the title: "Decisions of Commissioners."



## COMPLAINTS OF SCARCITY OF CARS.

During the fall of 1899 the commission received many complaints from shippers stating their inability to get cars for the shipment of grain and other produce to eastern markets. The commissioners in such cases acted promptly and made an endeavor to ascertain the cause of such apparent shortage of equipment and to have the situation relieved. In conference with the railway officials, they assured the board that no effort would be spared to supply Iowa shippers with cars as promptly as possible, and that the cause for their apparent shortage of cars had been the inability of lines east of Chicago to promptly move freight from the Chicago yards, thus allowing side tracks in such yards to become clogged with loaded cars destined to eastern points. This condition blocked all attempts to supply western shippers with cars, although some of the trunk lines operating in Iowa made large increase in their rolling stock.

From the investigations made by the board it seemed to be no fault of the Iowa railroads that shippers were suffering for want of cars, and that such companies were using their utmost endeavor to raise the Chicago blockade.

At the date of this report the conditions seemed to have again become normal, and no complaints are being filed with the commission.

## EXPRESS COMPANIES.

No complaints have been filed with the board during the past year against express companies with reference to rules or rates affecting the transportation of freight or merchandise in this state by express.

## INTERLOCKING SWITCH SYSTEM PROTECTING RAILROAD CROSSINGS AT GRADE.

Interlocking switch systems for the prevention of accidents at railroad crossings at grade are now in operation at the following points:

Carnforth, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Chicago & North-Western railways; Grand Junction, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Chicago and North-Western railways; Libertyville, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines railways; Fairfield, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railways; Ottumwa, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railways; Ottumwa, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railways; Belknap, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Wabash

railways; Neola, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railways; Seymour, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railways. Centerville, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Keokuk & Western railways; Davenport, crossing of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railways. Melbourne, crossing of Chicago Great Western and Iowa Central railways. Malvern, crossing of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy and Omaha & St. Louis railways; Ft. Madison, drawbridge of Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe over Mississippi river.

The interlocking device for the protection of trains at the drawbridge over the Mississippi river at Ft. Madison on the line of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, and the one at the crossing of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul at Ottumwa, were the only ones approved by the board during the past year.

It is believed that the coming year, with the increased prosperity to the railroad companies, will witness the installation of a number of these devices, seemingly now so necessary for the protection of life and property at grade railroad crossings.

It is, however, a serious question, and one that properly comes before the people of Iowa at this time, with several hundreds of miles of new railroad being constructed within the state, whether, under any circumstances, in future railroad construction in Iowa, one line of railway should be permitted to cross another at grade.

This question is respectfully submitted to the general assembly for its consideration.

## RAILROAD EMPLOYEES IN IOWA.

The following comparative table shows the number of railroad employes in Iowa for the past twenty-two years, with total annual compensation of all, and the average daily compensation of each, for as many years as the board is able to find statistics:



YEAR.	Number.	Yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.
1878	13,518	*	.....
1879	15,341	*	.....
1880	18,085	*	.....
1881	21,974	*	.....
1882	27,273	\$ 8,329,810.31	\$1.72
1883	26,731	13,154,288.07	1.55
1884	25,066	13,028,067.66	1.69
1885	25,761	13,677,780.53	1.69
1886	29,088	15,140,324.84	1.96
1887	30,794	16,335,348.31	1.88
1888	24,642	14,212,590.27	1.67
1889	24,351	16,218,133.69	2.12
1890	27,589	16,264,939.45	1.88
1891	30,192	17,870,915.89	1.89
1892	31,127	16,880,373.85	1.88
1893	29,308	16,378,740.81	1.78
1894	24,107	14,168,808.35	1.87
1895	28,165	16,052,796.79	1.83
1896	26,690	15,197,519.49	1.81
1897	30,009	17,280,215.01	1.83
1898	32,385	18,406,383.76	1.82

\*No data.

#### AUTOMATIC COUPLERS AND TRAIN BRAKES.

Chapter 50, laws of the Twenty-seventh General Assembly, provides that the time within which railway companies may have to equip cars with automatic couplers could be extended to January 1, 1900, by the commission, upon proper application by the companies desiring such extension of time. The following railway companies made such application and were granted on dates named until January 1, 1900, to equip cars with automatic couplers:

February 1, 1898: Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific; Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul; Sioux City & Pacific; Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha, Chicago & North-Western; Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern; Chicago Great Western; Minneapolis & St. Louis; Des Moines Union; Des Moines Northern & Western; Keokuk & Western; Illinois Central; Burlington system; Iowa Central.

February 7 1898: Wabash.

February 23, 1898: Sioux City & Northern; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe; Mason City & Ft. Dodge.

In this connection the following comparative table for years 1878 to 1899, inclusive, showing the number of cars as reported by Iowa railroads, with number equipped with train brakes and automatic couplers, number of employees, with number killed and injured coupling cars and falling from trains, will be found of interest, as indicating whether, as number of cars equipped with safety appliances

increases, the number of accidents to employees resulting from coupling cars and setting brakes decreases in proportion. It must be remembered, however, that the number of trains and cars has greatly increased, and in greater ratio than the number of employees. In other words, that practically the same number of men are now handling many more trains and cars than they did a few years ago:

#### AUTOMATIC COUPLERS AND TRAIN BRAKES.

##### COMPARATIVE TABLE

Number of cars equipped and number of employees and accidents to employees from coupling cars and falling from trains.

YEAR.	Number of all cars.	Equipped with automatic couplers.	Equipped with power brake.	Number of employees.	Number killed coupling cars.	Number injured coupling cars.	Number killed falling from trains.	Number injured falling from trains.
1878	29,087	.....	.....	13,518	.....	.....	.....	.....
1879	31,584	.....	.....	15,341	.....	.....	.....	.....
1880	34,451	.....	.....	18,085	.....	.....	.....	.....
1881	47,510	.....	.....	21,974	.....	.....	.....	.....
1882	55,206	.....	1,531	27,273	16	182	31	87
1883	98,106	.....	1,814	27,112	16	98	33	49
1884	103,337	.....	1,917	26,731	8	109	10	57
1885	102,835	.....	2,300	25,066	13	174	16	34
1886	127,178	.....	2,154	25,761	10	120	25	38
1887	91,067	.....	2,545	29,088	9	134	23	39
1888	113,975	.....	1,864	30,794	19	240	32	52
1889	120,757	4,210	3,636	24,642	8	149	5	44
1890	127,464	9,194	10,452	24,351	14	203	17	63
1891	130,163	18,178	14,398	27,589	13	348	23	82
1892	149,781	34,315	39,047	30,192	14	196	28	63
1893	142,730	40,871	39,296	31,127	10	196	22	68
1894	127,171	46,558	37,794	29,308	7	91	17	33
1895	138,721	56,853	53,078	24,107	5	80	20	37
1896	138,359	70,718	67,090	28,165	6	97	19	45
1897	171,909	101,851	90,684	26,690	7	80	14	35
1898	176,035	142,638	105,382	30,009	4	75	18	50
1899	190,730	180,505	127,907	32,385	12	72	12	64

#### ACCIDENTS TO PERSONS IN IOWA.

Iowa has been singularly free, with very few exceptions, from railroad disasters resulting in great loss of life.

The two notable exceptions have occurred within the past two or three years. Considering the greater number of trains now being operated, and the greatly increased speed of all trains, this condition in Iowa reflects great credit on railway management, and the integrity and reliability of the men whose duty it is to keep the track and roadbed in proper condition, and those employed in handling these trains. The public does not always appreciate how much it owes to these employees, who daily guard the lives of thousands of people, and property to the value of millions of dollars.

The subjoined table shows the number of accidents to persons in Iowa, passengers, employees and others, during the past twenty-two



years. The "others" refers to accidents at highway crossings, stealing rides, and trespassing, or "walking on track." The death list from the latter cause named is appalling, and the commissioners have in many former reports called attention to it. The number of accidents resulting from this cause still remains large, though the number reported this year, thirty-eight, is seven less than in 1898. It is hoped some effective means may yet be devised to prevent persons from walking on railroad tracks, who have no business thereon.

ACCIDENTS TO PERSONS IN IOWA.  
COMPARATIVE TABLE.

YEAR.	KILLED.			INJURED.		
	Passengers.	Employees.	Others.	Passengers.	Employees.	Others.
1878	20	29	31	51	137	35
1879	2	42	40	12	103	39
1880	5	37	38	9	140	34
1881	7	67	34	17	146	31
1882	7	89	69	61	502	72
1883	4	82	65	25	255	50
1884	6	72	51	47	343	59
1885	9	72	75	89	720	66
1886	8	61	62	35	336	74
1887	8	59	65	28	354	58
1888	10	101	69	77	564	86
1889	4	35	33	25	442	46
1890	9	73	69	67	579	101
1891	5	82	91	80	601	92
1892	23	80	76	64	258	77
1893	17	81	79	78	682	64
1894	7	48	90	62	367	63
1895	4	47	82	39	330	74
1896	6	36	94	63	411	84
1897	27	40	90	81	291	86
1898	5	44	114	30	301	70
1899	14	62	95	101	348	128

#### STATUTES OF IOWA RELATING TO RAILWAYS.

By permission of the executive council, the statutes of Iowa relating to railways, with digest of decisions of the supreme court, have been compiled from the code of 1897, and are printed in connection with this report as an appendix. It is believed this will be appreciated by the public interested in railroad operation and problems in Iowa.

#### NATIONAL CONVENTION OF STATE RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS.

On dates August 10 to 14, 1899, this board with its secretary met with like officers from nearly every state in the union and the Interstate Commerce Commission, at Denver, Col., it being the eleventh annual convention of railroad commissioners.

The papers presented by men prominent in state and national affairs dealing with the several phases of the railroad problem, and

the discussion by delegates of the matters thus presented, are of incalculable benefit to those who have been entrusted in the several states with the duty and responsibility of enforcing laws for the proper control of transportation companies.

Commissioner Dawson was made chairman of committee on delays attendant upon enforcing orders of railroad commissioners; Commissioner Palmer was appointed member of the committee on uniform classification of freights; Commissioner Mowry member of committee on classification of construction expenses; and Secretary Lewis member of committee on railroad statistics.

#### ORGANIZATION OF BOARD.

On January 4, 1899, Welcome Mowry of Tama county, having been duly elected and qualified, succeeded the Hon. Geo. W. Perkins, of Fremont county, as a member of the board, the term of the latter having expired.

On same day the board organized by electing Edward A. Dawson of Bremer county, its chairman, and Dwight N. Lewis of Polk county, its secretary, the term of the latter to begin February 1, 1899.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD A. DAWSON,  
DAVID J. PALMER,  
WELCOME MOWRY,  
*Commissioners.*

Attest:

DWIGHT N. LEWIS, *Secretary.*  
Des Moines, Iowa, December 4, 1899.



---

---

DECISIONS OF COMMISSIONERS.

---

---

## DECISIONS OF COMMISSIONERS.

### IN THE MATTER OF COAL RATES.

During the session of the Twenty-eighth General Assembly, Hon. Claude R. Porter, representative from the Fourth district, Centerville, Appanoose county, Iowa, introduced into the house the following concurrent resolution, which passed both branches of the legislature:

WHEREAS, The coal output of Iowa during the past several years has not only not increased, but very materially decreased, while the output from other states has increased.

WHEREAS, The coal companies of other states are, on account of extremely low rates being made by the different railroads entering Iowa, enabled to place their products in Iowa towns at a lower price than Iowa mines can possibly meet, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the house, the senate concurring, that the railway commissioners be, and are, hereby requested to investigate whether or not the decreased production of coal in Iowa is in any manner due to the adjustment of freight rates, and whether the same are so fixed as to discriminate in favor of the coal producers of other states to the disadvantage of coal producers of Iowa, and to ascertain if rates can be so equalized as to relieve any discrimination, if any be found to exist, and take such steps in the premises as deemed best, and make report as provided by law.

After conferring with interested parties, the board fixed September 29, 1898, at its office in Des Moines as the time for a hearing of the matter covered by the resolution, and all parties interested, including the Hon. C. R. Porter, mine operators and railroads, were duly notified of the time and place of the said hearing. On the date named in the notice, the board called up the matter, but neither Mr. Porter nor the interest which he represented were present to present their case. The railroad companies were quite fully represented by the officers of their freight departments.

In view of the absence of Mr. Porter, however, the board postponed the hearing until Wednesday, November 30, 1898.

The day following the date set for the hearing a letter dated September 29th was received from Mr. Porter as follows:

Your letter and telegram desiring my presence at a meeting of the railway commissioners on the 29th, in reference to soft coal rates, received. I am very sorry that circumstances are such that it is impossible for me to be present.

The coal operators here have talked to me regarding this matter and I find that they feel about as follows: The coal business in Iowa is on the decline and has been for several years. Statistics will show that the output of coal in the state of Illinois has increased very materially. The Iowa markets are being swallowed up by the Illinois coal operator and the Iowa coal operator is compelled to take a back seat. The coal mined in the Appanoose district is equal in quality to the Illinois coal. The coal operators here tell me that they are unable to figure a comparative statement of Illinois and Iowa coal delivered at Iowa points for the following reasons:

1st. They are unable to obtain coal tariffs from all the different roads handling Illinois coal in Iowa.



2d. The Illinois coal companies as a rule, make a delivered price on their product and it is impossible to separate the coal and freight. I will state here that the writer knows this to be true, having had occasion to investigate the cost of fuel for all state institutions.

The coal operators do not care to make a direct charge against the railroad companies; they are not unfriendly. The railroad companies tell them, "we are giving you the Iowa commissioner's tariff;" they also say to them, "our rates from Illinois are based on the Iowa tariff." This is true. One thing the operator would like to know—If the Iowa coal rates are as the railroad companies claim, too low, why do they apply them through the state of Illinois, where the Illinois tariff would permit them to charge more? This would suggest that the Iowa tariff was too high? The coal operators of this district feel that they are entitled to a rate on mine run coal. The writer certainly agrees with them. All other districts in Iowa have it. Should it not apply from Appanoose or be canceled at other points? The railroad companies will tell the commissioners that there is too small a per cent of screenings from Appanoose mines. This is not the case and an investigation on the part of the commissioners will show that it is not. Mine run rates are made from all districts in Iowa, (except Appanoose) for Missouri river points and west in Nebraska. All principal Missouri coal districts have mine run rates. A mine run rate of \$1.01 now applies from Stahl, Mo., on the Pittsburg & Gulf railway to Omaha. Stahl is located about ten miles west of Kirksville, Mo., and the coal produced there is exactly the same as that mined in the Appanoose district. Bevier, Mo., has a mine run rate of \$1.01 to Omaha, via Hannibal & St. Joseph railway. The Missouri Pacific railway has the same rate from mines on its line to Omaha. The lowest rate the Appanoose mines are able to obtain, is the commissioners' rate of \$1.40 to Council Bluffs and \$1.42 to Omaha. Why should the Appanoose district not be put on the same basis as the Oskaloosa district where they enjoy a \$1.01 rate on the mine run? A proportionate rate would figure about \$1.13 or \$1.14 for the Appanoose district.

The operators here feel that the above matters can be handled only in one way, and that is for the commissioners to take the data they have in their office and investigate all of the above, and if they find it a true statement, ask the railroads to do their part.

Yours very truly,

CLAUDE R. PORTER.

Upon receipt of this communication the board issued a further notice to all parties concerned, enclosing therewith copy of the resolutions heretofore reported, together with copy of Mr. Porter's letter of September 29th. The notice read as follows:

OCTOBER 1, 1898.

DEAR SIR—Agreeable to the understanding at the recent hearing in the matter of classification and coal rates, which was postponed, as you may be aware, on account of the fact that the Hon. Claude R. Porter, member of the house of representatives, from Centerville, Iowa, who introduced the resolution in the late general assembly in deference to which the investigation on the subject of coal rates has been instituted, was unable to be present at the hearing had in this office on September 29th, copy of said resolutions is enclosed herewith. It was agreed, on the part of the representatives of the railroad companies and the coal interests present, to postpone further consideration of the matter until Wednesday, November 30th, at 10 A. M. Meantime there is enclosed for your information copy of communication received from Mr. Porter on September 30th, the day following the hearing, explanatory of his position in reference to the subject matter under consideration.

Very respectfully,

W. W. AINSWORTH,  
Secretary.

By order of the board.

Before November 30th, however, some of the traffic managers of the railroad companies stated to the board they had interests which would necessitate their personal attention at another city on or about the same time, and asked that a further postponement be granted. The matter was taken up with Mr. Claude R. Porter, and he stated under date of November 17th that he knew of no objections to a further postponement, and the board accordingly granted the request of the parties and fixed January 4, 1899, as date for hearing; which notice read as follows and was sent all parties interested, the same as was done with previous notices:

NOVEMBER 25, 1898.

DEAR SIR—I am directed to advise you that the hearing in the matter of rates on soft coal in Iowa, which was set for November 30, 1898, has been postponed by request of parties, until January 4, 1899, at 10 A. M., at the office of the board of railroad commissioners in Des Moines, Iowa. Very respectfully,

W. W. AINSWORTH,  
Secretary.

By order of the Board.

Owing to the fact that the board had a similar case before it on January 17th, it was suggested by some of the parties interested in the coal rate case that the coal rate hearing be again postponed to that date in order that parties interested in both cases might not be required to make two trips. This being agreeable to Mr. Porter, all parties were notified accordingly and the hearing again postponed until January 17th.

On January 16, 1899, the following letter was received by the board from Hon. Claude R. Porter, which explains itself:

CENTERVILLE, IOWA, January 14, 1899.

Railroad Commissioners, Des Moines, Iowa:

DEAR SIR—I believe that the hearing on soft coal rates before you is set for the 17th, and thinking that perhaps my presence at that time might be expected, I thought I had better inform you in advance of my inability to be present. The parties about here who are most directly interested in the proposed investigation and at whose instigation the resolution directing the inquiry was introduced in the house by myself, owing to a variety of circumstances are, it seems, unable to take hold of the matter and give it the attention that its importance requires, and as I am compelled to depend upon them for data, etc., you will see that I am not in a position to be of any assistance to you in making the inquiry.

I believe now, as I did at the time of introducing the resolution, that it is a matter of importance to many people of the state and especially of this locality; that wrongs do exist in the premises and that benefits would result from their being righted, and I deeply regret that I can be of no practical help to you. I will not reiterate my views on the subject, as they were briefly set out in my letter addressed to you in November last.

Very respectfully,

(Signed)

CLAUDE R. PORTER.

Upon the date fixed in the notice for the hearing there appeared before the board the following named persons representing the coal interest in various parts of the state:

Hon. H. L. Byers, state senator, Lucas, Iowa; Messrs. Evans, of Lucas; Ramsey, of Beacon; Rosbrook, of Oskaloosa; H. H. Canfield, of Boone; and Bates, who has mines on the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and Wabash railroads. Mr. E. G. Bent, of Oglesby, Ill., having an interest on the Illinois Central railroad near that place, was also present at the hearing.

The following named agents represented the respondents before the board:

A. C. Bird, general traffic manager Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company; W. B. Hamblin, assistant general freight agent Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company; J. M. Bechtel, division freight agent Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company; M. C. Markham, assistant traffic manager Illinois Central Railroad company; W. E. Keepers, general freight agent Illinois Central Railroad company; H. Gower, general freight agent Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company; D. J. Birmingham, chief clerk division freight agent Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company; T. H. Simmons, general freight agent Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company; R. M. Calkins, general freight agent Des Moines & Northwestern Railway company; P. Hallenbeck, division freight agent Chicago & North-Western Railway company; T. N. Hooper, division freight agent Chicago Great Western Railway company; J. N. Tittmore, general freight agent Iowa Central Railway company;



Mr. Lund, assistant freight agent of the Wabash Railroad company; W. B. Jennings, traveling freight agent of the Wabash Railroad company.

Hon. Claude R. Porter did not appear at the hearing.

Hon. H. L. Byers, of Lucas, representing his own mines and other mine operators and owners of his district, made the first statement, the substance of which was, that the mine owners and operators of his district hoped the commissioners would retain the present rates on coal in Iowa. He stated he did not believe that the coal output in Iowa had materially decreased for the past several years, but that, if true, the cause for the same would be readily accounted for by the working out of many large mines throughout the state and the abandonment of the same by their operators. New fields were being opened constantly but the new mines did not seem to be capable of the large output of the abandoned mines of former years. He does not believe that should any decrease in the coal output be shown it should be accounted for by discrimination against Iowa mines on the part of the railroad companies. Iowa mines are turning down orders that they cannot fill. He found upon investigation that, as compared with the Iowa schedule, the rates in Illinois are somewhat higher, and that no coal, to any considerable amount, was being shipped into Iowa, in territory which rightfully belonged to his mines. There may be some coal, however, from Illinois, that comes into Iowa. However, considerable Iowa coal goes into Nebraska. He stated further that he was satisfied with the freight rates as they now exist in the state of Iowa, and "we are seeking capital to bring our output up to a high figure and we believe the conditions are auspicious to realize this result." Either Mr. Porter, on his own motion, introduced the resolution, having a vivid imagination at the time, or he supposed that the operators in his own district and other districts of Iowa would be in full accord with the spirit of the resolution. It may be at the time he thought the assertions in the resolution were right but it seems if he did have the backing, that with the run they have had this winter they are satisfied that the intent of the resolution is wrong, or it may be he did not have, but assumed to have, the backing of those operators. At least the ultimate result reaches the same ends. He does not have the statistics at hand to substantiate his resolution. Until that can be substantiated I do not see very much to contest over in this resolution. However, I will state this: I have had occasion to consult with quite a number of operators, here and elsewhere, and they say that my ideas represent their feelings on the subject and that they are well satisfied with the conditions as they are at present, and say to me, "If you appear before the commissioners and see that our presence is needed there call us up, but unless we are needed there we will not go, as it is expensive, unless it is absolutely necessary."

He further stated he believed that mines should be given the advantage of their situation as to certain markets, as it was as fair for one locality as for another. In his testimony before the board, Mr. Byers, among other things, said: "We have had no complaint from our agents that they could not dispose of any coal in northwestern Iowa, on account of the inter-state rates. Our experience has been, of course, that in shipping over two roads, it makes it a little higher than if the mine was located on but one line. But the mine that can get into that territory without shipping over two lines has the advantage of location, and we have no right to ask the railroad company to make up for us the natural disadvantage on account of the location of the mine."

"I am not thoroughly conversant with the Illinois coal, but I am told that a greater portion of the Illinois product is of a little better quality than the Iowa

product for domestic purposes. The use of slack coal for producing steam is becoming more prevalent year by year.

"The question of rates as established by the railroad commissioners or the railroad companies, I do not think have been any factor in the abandonment of many of the large mines in the last few years. They have simply been worked out and their owners have hunted new fields. The present rates are satisfactory. We never have any complaint from customers under the present rates. They sometimes object to the price of coal, and if they could get it in Illinois cheaper than in Iowa they would undoubtedly go into Illinois and get it.

"There are different grades of coal taken from the mines for which different prices are received on the market. For instance slack is not worth as much as lump, neither is nut and pea nor mine run coal worth as much on the market as lump coal.

"The railroad companies have granted us a rate proportionate, seemingly, to the value of the product shipped. The mine run rate is not so much as the lump rate. In fact, mine run is classified the same as pea and slack.

"Mr. Porter asks for the mine run rates in Council Bluffs and Omaha.

"From the Appanoose and Mystic districts most of the coal is mined from under the coal. The coal falls and breaks in large lumps, and there is not much more than 15 per cent of fine coal. If they should run that coal in as mine run, it would be about the same as the lump coal from other mines. He asks a 39 cents per ton privilege in favor of that. Their mine run coal is simply a lump coal in other localities, and it would neither be just to the railroad nor to the other producers should they be allowed the same rates for their mine run coal, which is equivalent to lump coal, as is granted mine run coal from other localities. If they produce the same kind of mine run as other mines, of course that would be different. Lump coal is the coal that passes over the screen. It varies, according to the quality of the coal, from one to two inches; in some instances where the coal is hard, one-inch screen, other places screens two inches. The process of mining coal under the longwall system does not break coal as by drilling and chuting it out. Their mine run coal is the same as lump coal in other places."

Mr. Bates, having interests in mines on the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern and Wabash railroads in Iowa, corroborated the statements of Senator Byers in all particulars.

Generally speaking, Mr. Bates said the mines in Iowa are thin and pocket, and it consequently makes it somewhat more expensive to mine coal in Iowa than in Illinois.

Mr. Ramsey, interested in mines at Beacon on the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railway, stated in substance that his district, the Oskaloosa district, is the largest district in the state of Iowa. "We have been in competition with the Centerville district coal for the past ten years. They have been taking the trade from the Oskaloosa district by their coal being a better quality. When they ask that the Centerville district be put on the same mine run rate as the Oskaloosa district, that would put us out of the business entirely. I ask our agents who are our strongest competitors, and they say the Centerville coal, because it is better than ours. The Hocking Valley coal is best. They tell me in Minnesota that the price does not make so much difference, but they would prefer the Hocking Valley to the Centerville because of smoke."



"The largest mines in the Oskaloosa district are the Muchaknock mines, Excelsior mines and the Carbonado mines. We have a capacity of about 200 cars of coal. The coal is pockety. In our district I have heard no complaint about the coal rates. In selling our coal in the northwestern part of the state the greatest competition we have is from the Appanoose district and not coal from other states; if they were put on the same rate as the Oskaloosa, we would be shut out entirely. The reason we have lost some of our trade to the Centerville district is because it is better coal. It is a better domestic coal, but is not as good for steam or railroad purposes."

Mr. Rosbrook, a mine operator at Oskaloosa, stated that he had been engaged at this business about eighteen years; that last year they loaded about 148,000 tons. "Our coal is superior to the Centerville district coal for engine use, but the Centerville coal is the better domestic coal, as it is a little more inflammable. We ship a portion of our coal north, some of it reaching into Minnesota, a little goes into Dakota; we ship east and west over the Rock Island; we have one mine in connection with the North-Western, and ship to Sioux City, Omaha, etc. The rates are very fair, I think, in Iowa."

"We do not have any trouble with Illinois on the Rock Island west of Des Moines and we ship on the Rock Island east as far as Iowa City. The output of coal in Iowa in 1898 will be a little more than in 1897, and in 1897 the Iowa mines were straining every nerve on account of the Illinois strike, but I think the output for 1898 will show a slight increase. I think the output in the future in Iowa will be less unless some new fields are discovered. So far as mine run rate is concerned from the Appanoose district, that would be merely a subterfuge. When I can load my coal as they mine it and save 20 per cent on the freight I will do it. Some of those mines do not have screens, just run their coal by chutes into the cars. They do not make slack enough down there to fire their own engines. Their fine coal is mixed with fire clay and they would not dare to put that in as their mine run. If the mine run rate is put in, I challenge any gentleman to pick out their mine run coal and tell it from our lump. None of our mines run lower than 25 per cent screenings. In the Centerville district not 5 per cent of the coal is screenings, perhaps 10 per cent coal and fire clay. The Centerville coal is too light for steam purposes. Coal from that district shipped into Omaha was screened after it arrived there and sold for lump coal. It is true that Centerville coal is shipped right past our mines in competition with us. I do not think that the Iowa mines produce enough coal now for Iowa consumption, at least the way the trade and demand runs. The dealers used to stock up but they have quit that; they use the railroad cars now."

Mr. Evans, a mine owner of Lucas, Iowa, has been in the coal business for the past seven years. "We have a mine something like the Centerville district—vein two and one-half feet thick. We mine it underneath. Our coal makes very little fine coal. We do not compete with other lines into Omaha. I would judge the actual coal difference between our lump coal and mine run would be about 5 per cent, but the fine coal and fire clay about 13 per cent, so when it comes to mine run we cannot come into competition with other lines. They get a mine run rate of 45 cents per ton, while we get 85 cents for our mine run. We have no fault to find with the classification made by the commissioners, and, if the freight was 10 cents less, it would not do us any good, because of the difference in price at the mines. I will state our coal is all sold for domestic purposes, and the coal we come into competition with most is Centerville coal. Where Centerville

is one local rate, we cannot possibly sell our coal. Centerville coal gets into Osceola now for 18 cents, and since that time we have been unable to ship any coal into Osceola, and only eighteen miles from our mine."

Mr. E. G. Bent, who has mining interests on the Illinois Central railroad at Oglesby, Ill., and is also secretary of the Wilmington, Streator and Third Vein fields, said, that while the output of coal in Illinois has greatly increased in late years, it is not true that the shipment of coal from Illinois into Iowa has increased, but the reverse is true to a large extent. The coal that comes from Illinois into Iowa in competition with Iowa coal is from the northern Illinois district—the Bloomington and Third Vein coal, both worked by the same long wall system. Both of these coals cost the same to produce as the coal in Appanoose county does. It can be easily shown that less than 2 per cent of the production of the Illinois mines enters Iowa at all. The cost of mining coal in the Illinois district referred to, I think, is about 40 cents per ton. I think the price in Appanoose county for mining is a little less than in the northern Illinois district, but the cost of the bed work is more, so it costs about the same on the cars.

"The only coal coming into Iowa is domestic coal. We are also producing domestic coal and it is not a good steam coal. The trouble in regard to the price of coal in Iowa is largely due to competition between the districts in the state. It should also be noticed that the trouble is between the companies in Appanoose county. There has been large development on tonnage not justified and an effort made to maintain that tonnage. A great many of the companies are small, some of them lack business management, and then having nothing but domestic coal it cannot be sold at a profit to the miners during the summer season. The markets are demoralized every season and then they look outside for the cause. I state this with more confidence because I get my information direct from the county."

Mr. H. H. Canfield, representing mining interests at Boone, stated that he was somewhat familiar with the conditions in Appanoose county and he thought there were too many people there who should not be in the coal fields. It does not require much capital to mine coal in Appanoose county. As a result there are a large number of mines open.

Concerning the apparent decrease in the output of Iowa coal, Mr. Canfield thought that the weather had been against the mine operators, the farmers were burning cobs and hedges instead of coal, but that now conditions are better. "The commissioners have given us a good tariff. If one mine can produce coal cheaper than another, that is good luck. The rates have been satisfactory and I do not think any change would benefit the state and I know it would not benefit me."

Mr. J. N. Tittemore, the general freight agent of the Iowa Central Railway company, said: "So far as the Centerville people are concerned I do not believe now that they feel that their case was a good one. I think they were a little grieved at that time, but have stated since that time that they had no case even with the Omaha rate because their output has gradually increased. We have at no time been able to furnish one-half the cars they wanted for shipment. We have been behind from 250 to 350 cars per day."

Mr. A. C. Bird, general traffic manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, stated: "It seems to me that what the operators have said leaves the railroads very little to say. The testimony is entirely favorable to the railroad companies and comes from people we are supposed to have wronged.



"I want to enter a denial to that part of the preamble concerning the decrease of the coal output of Iowa. The output of coal in Iowa has increased; the output of 1898 has been the largest of any year of record. The output of any other state or states may not have increased. It is clear that the shipments into Iowa from Illinois have diminished.

"I think the second proposition in the preamble has been disproved. If you would apply the rates obtaining in Illinois and Iowa to the average distance of a shipment of coal, you would find the rates in Illinois are higher than in Iowa. The interstate rates between Iowa and Illinois points are greater to a material degree than the Iowa distance tariff, which applies locally within the state of Iowa. We have no complaints that rates in Iowa are excessive.

"The railway official is perhaps in closer touch with the people than any other class of men in the state. I am happy to say, and I think the commission will be able to substantiate what I say, that as a general proposition the people of Iowa and the railroads are at peace with each other and with this condition between the producer, the shippers and the carriers, it would be impossible for any serious objection to any rate being in existence without our knowing it, and no case of such discontent could exist without the commission knowing it. In view of no complaint and the lower Iowa rates, I think it may be presumed that there is nothing left in this case and it would be in perfect order and quite proper that it be dismissed.

"Our company is peculiarly located with reference to the soft coal interests in the state. Practically all of our interest is in Appanoose county. We have done everything to facilitate the coal interest and, therefore, have been brought in close contact and close knowledge of the situation.

"I want to say to the commission that, as a matter of fact, for the last four or five years I have given up all effort to supply our larger towns with steam coal, simply because there is no slack or steam coal produced on our line. It would be a gross injustice to concede to Appanoose district a mine run rate. It would make a low rate on the highest grade of coal they produce. A low rate was made into Omaha from the Iowa mines simply to enable the Iowa operator to get his product into an adjoining state in competition with Kansas, Missouri and other states.

"It may be pointed out that none of the things presumed to be true in the preamble to the resolution under consideration are true. The people in whose interest this resolution was made and meeting called have realized there was nothing in it."

Mr. M. C. Markham, assistant traffic manager of the Illinois Central Railway company, stated: "As to the Illinois coal that has been coming into Iowa over the Illinois Central, we have a statement prepared showing the number of cars from September 1, 1895, to August 31, 1896. For that period we put into Iowa 3,189 cars of Illinois coal; for the next year, September 1, 1896, to August 31, 1897, 2,564 cars; September 1, 1897, to August 31, 1898, 1,945 cars, a decrease of 40 per cent of what it was two years ago.

"With reference to the allegation in regard to the interstate rates being lower than the Iowa rates, I have a statement showing what the tariff rates from the La Salle district, which is the northern Illinois field, into Iowa, and what those rates would be if computed under the Iowa tariff. Taking the point Delaware, which is fifty miles west of the Mississippi river, the tariff rate \$1.55 per ton from La Salle, rates computed with Iowa tariff to the same point for the same

distance, \$1.27. The slack rate is \$1.10, a difference of 54 cents per ton. Take Iowa Falls, the rate is \$2 per ton; the Iowa tariff, \$1.50; pea and slack, \$1.26.

"The Fort Dodge rate, \$2.05; Iowa tariff, \$1.58; pea and slack, \$1.28. The rate to Le Mars, \$2.41; the Iowa tariff, \$1.80; pea and slack, \$1.39.

"The rates in Illinois and Iowa for certain distances are compared as per the following:

"Twenty-five miles, Illinois rate, 60 cents.

Iowa rate, lump, 46 cents.

Pea and slack, 37 cents.

"Fifty miles, Illinois rate, 85 cents.

Iowa rate, lump, 66 cents.

Pea and slack, 52 cents.

"One hundred miles, Illinois rate, \$1.

Iowa rate, lump, \$1.

Pea and slack, 74 cents.

"One hundred and fifty miles, Illinois rate, \$1.10.

Iowa rate, lump, \$1.15.

Pea and slack, 89 cents."

Mr. H. Gower, general freight agent of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company, said in substance: "I would like to emphasize in regard to the mine run rates in effect from the Iowa mines to Omaha. We do not pretend to say that rate is a proper rate. We have always been opposed to it. The rate was put during the contest when the Iowa mines were competing with the Kansas and other mines. We got down, finally, to the \$1.10 rate, but we put it in simply to enable our mines to compete with mines outside the state. I do not think mine run coal is much used in Iowa. The Centerville people were at that time accorded the same basis of rates, but we found that that coal was screened at Omaha and sold for domestic purposes, which made a rank discrimination against the Oskaloosa district."

Mr. Gower filed the following table showing shipment of coal from Illinois mines into Iowa as compared with the shipments from Iowa mines during the same period:

#### FROM IOWA MINES.

Winter 1893-4.....	16,960 cars
Winter 1894-5.....	16,209 cars
Winter 1895-6.....	17,018 cars
Winter 1896-7.....	15,210 cars
Winter 1897-8.....	15,237 cars

Total..... 80,634 cars

At 20 tons per car equals..... 1,612,680 tons

#### FROM ILLINOIS MINES.

Winter 1893-4.....	517 cars
Winter 1894-5.....	402 cars
Winter 1895-6.....	1,033 cars
Winter 1896-7.....	901 cars
Winter 1897-8.....	366 cars

Total..... 3,219 cars

At 20 tons per car equals..... 64,380 tons (4 per cent)



Mr. W. B. Hamblin, assistant freight agent of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company, said: "The greatest trouble we have is to induce our Illinois miners to believe that we are not discriminating against them in favor of Iowa mines. The rates from Illinois into Iowa are higher than either the Illinois or Iowa distance tariffs, and I want to say that, so far as our own line is concerned, I do not believe in five years we have put any coal into Iowa except river cities, where it could not come into competition with our own mines."

Mr. Hamblin filed a table of rates from mines at Ladd, Ill., to certain Iowa points as compared with the Iowa rates for the same distances, which statement is as follows:

TARIFF RATES.

FROM LADD, ILL., TO—	SOFT COAL.		Distance in miles.	IOWA DISTANCE TARIFF.	
	Lump.	Pea & slack.		Lump.	Pea & slack.
Mt. Pleasant.....	\$ 1.50	\$ 1.25	145	\$ 1.13½	\$ .87½
Ottumwa.....	1.85	1.49	193	1.28½	1.02½
Albia.....	2.00	1.59	218	1.34	1.08
Osceola.....	2.18	1.79	275	1.46	1.20
Red Oak.....	2.40	1.97	360	1.62	1.30
Pacific Junction.....	2.46	2.02	394	1.70	1.34
Des Moines.....	2.21	1.82	286	1.48	1.22
Leon.....	2.21	1.82	285	1.48	1.22
Indianola.....	2.18	1.79	282	1.48	1.22
Carson City.....	2.46	2.02	390	1.68	1.33

Mr. Hamblin also stated that their Iowa tonnage for 1898 was probably 30,000 to 40,000 tons greater than in 1897.

Mr. T. H. Simmons, general freight agent of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company, filed the following statement showing the number of cars of coal shipped to points on his line from Illinois mines as compared with the number of cars shipped from Iowa mines from January 1, 1891, to December 31, 1897:

	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	TOTAL.
Public—								
Illinois.....	3,767	4,376	3,853	2,050	3,109	3,280	1,463	21,898
Iowa.....	3,234	3,690	3,522	4,154	3,947	3,247	4,642	26,336
Total.....	7,001	8,066	7,375	6,204	6,956	6,527	6,105	48,234

Mr. Simmons stated that all the coal they had on their line was at What Cheer and that nearly all of the coal that was handled on his road went over two roads.

Mr. Lund, assistant freight agent of the Wabash railway, stated that they carried no coal from Illinois into Iowa and their coal shipments were purely local.

## COAL OUTPUT IN IOWA.

Statement of amount of coal mined in Iowa from 1895 to 1898 inclusive, furnished by the state mine inspectors:

YEAR ENDING—	TONNAGE.
June 30, 1895.....	3,195,836
June 30, 1896.....	3,525,490
June 30, 1897.....	3,799,734
June 30, 1898.....	4,052,557

The board of railroad commissioners, as heretofore stated, has made repeated attempts to get all parties together who are interested in the coal rates in Iowa. Notices of hearings were published in the daily press and written notices sent mine operators and railway companies. At the hearing no one requested a lower coal rate or suggested any change in the present coal rates in Iowa, Mr. Porter himself sending a letter explanatory of his absence.

Under these circumstances the commissioners sought to ascertain the real situation concerning the coal industry in the state of Iowa, so far as its relation to the transportation question is concerned, and have set out quite fully abstracts of statements made by interested parties in Iowa, that the public may know upon what statement of facts the board must base its conclusion.

The statistics furnished by the state mine inspecting department not only disprove the statement that, "the coal output of Iowa, during the past several years, has not only not increased, but very materially decreased," but, on the contrary, show a material increase in the output of Iowa mines since the year 1895, and a fluctuating condition prior to that time.

The testimony offered at the hearing clearly establishes that the shipment of Illinois coal into Iowa is decreasing to a very marked extent year by year; that the rates charged by the railroad companies on coal shipped from points in Illinois to points in Iowa are higher than the Iowa rate would be for the same distance, and that no undue advantage or preference is given to Illinois operators as against Iowa mines. Inasmuch as all the testimony offered before the board by coal operators and representatives of the railway companies, as well as other information which the commissioners were able to obtain, seems to prove the inaccuracy of the statements made in the preamble to the resolution under which this investigation was had, the board of railroad commissioners can reach but one conclusion in this matter.

We can find no reason, at this time, why the rates on soft coal in Iowa, as heretofore established and promulgated by this board and now in effect, should be disturbed.

Des Moines, February 16, 1899.

No. 2002—1899.

A. D. RASMUSSEN, JESSE HILL, *et al.*,

V.

BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Shipping privileges at Pioneer Hay Camp.*

Petition filed September 30, 1898.

## DECISION OF COMMISSIONERS.

On date named the commissioners received the following:

*State Board of Railroad Commissioners:*

The undersigned citizens and land owners residing near a railroad switch or siding on the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railroad, known as the "Pioneer Hay Camp," and



located on section twelve (12) in township one hundred (100), range thirty-nine (39), in Osceola county, Iowa, respectfully represent to your honorable board that said switch or siding has been in existence or use for more than ten years last past, and has been of great convenience and benefit to farmers and others residing in the vicinity thereof.

That for more than ten years it has been the custom of the railroad company to furnish its cars to all persons desiring to ship freight from said switch or siding, and that large quantities of hay and grain and other farm produce have been shipped from said siding to the mutual advantage of the shippers and railroad company, and said business of receiving and shipping freight from said switch has been continued through each year for more than ten years last past.

That said siding or switch by the nearest traveled wagon road is six miles from either Lake Park or Round Lake, the nearest stations on the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railroad.

That at the instigation and request of the grain dealers at Lake Park, as your petitioners verily believe, the said railroad company is about to close and remove said siding and switch to the serious inconvenience and great damage of your petitioners, who, if this their petition is denied, will hereafter be compelled to take their farm produce for shipment to Lake Park or Round Lake.

That as citizens and residents of said vicinity, your petitioners respectfully request your honorable board to investigate the facts with reference to the establishment, continuance and final removal of said siding or switch, and that your board make an order directing said railroad company to establish, erect and maintain a depot and station at the place where said siding has existed, and that the same be kept open for the transaction of such business as is usual and ordinary at railroad stations in Iowa.

That if after such investigation your board should find that the facts do not warrant the making of an order for the erection and maintenance of a depot and station that you then make an order that said siding and switch be restored and kept open for the shipment and receipt of freight in carload lots as heretofore.

(Signed)

J. W. SALYARDS,  
S. L. WEAVER,  
JOHN P. GREENLAND,  
O. D. ASHLEY,  
JESSE HILL,  
THOS. MCCORMACK,  
A. R. HATFIELD,  
R. E. KNUDSON,  
OREN GOWEN,  
And about 140 others.

LAKE PARK, Iowa, September 26, 1898.

*The Honorable Board of Railroad Commissioners:*

DEAR SIRS—I want to cite you to some facts not set forth in the petition.

In the fall of 1896, I represented H. L. Williams, of Primghar, and put up a temporary house at Harris and made application for grounds to build a freight house, and Mr. Knapp, their traveling freight agent, who is in charge of these matters, or seems to be, promised grounds provided we would build at once, but as he seems to be interested in the firm doing business at Round Lake, Harris and Lake Park, he granted the Winfield Bros. the grounds, although they did not build until the next harvest, showing he is either interested in their business or prejudiced against me, for this switch has remained here for years until I bought five cars this fall and at that time they were putting new steel rails down. As soon as requested by grain dealers (they) tore out the switch. If this is not discrimination I don't know. I was at Round Lake and they bought oats 16 cents for 33 pounds; track bids was 18¢ for 33 pounds, leaving a profit of \$27.15 on 1,000 bushels, allowing 10 bushels for shrinkage. Lake Park was running at 17 cents, leaving \$17.15 per car and the 1 pound, which they take. They take 33 pounds of oats, 50 pounds of barley and from 50 to 64 of wheat, and there is no place you can sell 100 or 200 bushels of grain and have them take legal weight.

I can build a house suitable for the grain business of the place.

(Signed)

JESSE HILL.

The complaint was forwarded to the railway company, and Mr. W. P. Brady, general agent, filed its answer thereto as follows:

"The siding in controversy was located by this road many years ago, to accommodate large hay shipments that the Pioneer hay camp made tributary to that

point, but, as is well known to the members of the commission, the cultivation of the land has been a serious detriment to wild hay shipments in that vicinity of the state during the past five or six years, and I think I can say that in that period very little hay has been gathered for shipment at this point. It was decided, in view of the extra risks and hazards to trains by the location of a switch between stations in a country community, and the further fact that the object for which the siding was put in rendering it no longer necessary, to take the switch out about two months ago. Our freight records do not show that any material quantity of freight has ever been marketed at that point except hay shipments. The Pioneer hay camp was located just six miles from Round Lake, Minn., and the same distance from Lake Park, Iowa, and the same distance from Harris, Iowa, all on the Iowa Falls division of this road, and all the stations being Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern shipping points. Prior to the track being taken up an investigation was had, and it was proved conclusively to the management of this railway that it was superfluous in its present location, and the risks of having it on the main line of our road greatly offset the advantages it extended to either the railway company or the residents in that community.

"On behalf of the company I most strenuously deny all the allegations and charges made in the copy of letter addressed to your honorable board by Mr. Jesse Hill, of Lake Park, Iowa, under date of September 2, 1898. If there have ever been any suggestions made by the grain shippers at any of these points to have the company vacate this siding, they have never reached the ear of the management. The reasons for its being taken out, we think, were just and sufficient, and, if any more arguments are necessary, we feel persuaded we can fully convince your honorable board that we did not act either hastily or in a prejudicial manner in regard to doing away with this siding."

A great amount of correspondence passed between the board and the parties to the controversy, and, as it seemed impossible for any settlement of the case to be reached in this way, November 22, 1898, was set for a hearing of the matter, and all parties given due notice thereof. On date named, however, severe snowstorms blocked the train on which the commissioners were striving to reach this point, and the hearing had to be abandoned. At a later date, however—February 28, 1899—after due notice, the commissioners went to Pioneer Hay Siding and heard all parties desiring to appear before them.

From the testimony offered at the hearing, and from letters and statements filed and made a part of the case, the commissioners find the facts to be about as follows:

That there is no town or station at what is known as Pioneer Hay Camp, but that several years ago the railway company maintained a siding there for the purpose of accommodating the shipments of the large amount of hay at that time raised annually on adjoining land; that the siding in question was located about midway between Lake Park, Iowa, and Round Lake, Minn., flourishing stations on this line of road twelve miles apart; that when the land tributary and adjoining to this siding was taken up by settlers who broke the land and engaged in the ordinary diversified farming, the railway company removed the siding, claiming that hay shipments in such quantities that warranted its maintenance had ceased, and that the switch located in the country, far removed from regular stations, was a menace to the safe operation of trains; that some of the complainants wished to erect grain warehouses or elevators at this siding should it be restored, for the purpose of doing a regular grain business.



Many farmers testified at the hearing, a number of them being residents of Minnesota, and while all stated they desired the siding restored, it was not shown that they were greatly inconvenienced by the present arrangement of stations on this and other lines of railroad running into that territory, no one testifying that he had a greater distance to haul his product to market than six miles, and the greater number having less than that distance. It was not shown that the business at this place would be of sufficient importance to require a regularly appointed station, and parties testifying did not so represent, but asked that the siding be restored, and that they be allowed to load cars with grain and other merchandise for shipment, and receive their coal and other freight thereon. Some complaint was made that there was a combination formed by the grain buyers of neighboring towns to fix prices, and that grain had often been wrongfully classified, to the disadvantage of the producer, and that for this and other reasons independent buyers should be allowed to do business at Pioneer Hay Camp. From such information as is before them, the commissioners would hardly be justified in holding that any such combination existed, and there may be serious doubt whether, if such combination did exist, it could be considered by the board in passing upon the merits of the petition that the railway company restore the switch and set out cars for loading and unloading thereon.

In the case of *W. C. Smith et al., v. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company*, decided September 14, 1898, which may be found on page 27 of report of this board for 1898, in matter of re-establishing switch between Glendale and Lockridge, the commissioners say:

"In reaching a conclusion and a decision in this matter, other interests as well as those of the railway company and the mine owners or lessees, must be considered, and one is the interests that the public has in requiring the railway company to operate its line of railway so that there will be the least possible danger or hazard to life or property.

"Would this board be justified in any case in making an order requiring a railway company, that is conducting and carrying on the immense volume of business that this road is at the present time, to construct upon its main thoroughfare a sidetrack for the purpose of placing thereon empty and loaded cars, at a point not protected by any agent or employee of the company, but on the contrary exposed, without protection, to the dangers that naturally arise in allowing cars to remain unprotected where they might be carried from the sidetrack onto its main line, and thus become a standing menace to the property of the railway company, its employees and the travelling public? This is a matter of public concern.

"We believe that it will not be seriously controverted that at times, on account of storms and high winds, cars may be carried from the side track to the main line or wrecked thereon, or, through the unlawful interference of persons, switches may be left open, thereby endangering the trains upon the main line.

"There may be a class of cases requiring sidetracks to be constructed upon the main line of a railway, not at or near a regular station thereon, but this board would hesitate before making such an order in any case, and a much stronger showing would have to be made than has been made in this case, and, if the occasion should require such an order in the future, this board would feel that its duty to the public would demand that every possible safeguard should be made against accident or casualty which might be occasioned by the construction of such a switch at such an unusual place. The public has a right to every possi-

ble protection against accident or extra hazard in the operation of railway trains."

The commissioners, after carefully considering all the facts and circumstances connected with this case, have reached the unanimous conclusion that they would not be justified, at the present time, in making any order herein.

Des Moines, Iowa, August 8, 1899.

No. 2003—1899.

In the matter of approval of an interlocking switch system or safety device at grade crossing of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul and Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway companies' lines near Ottumwa, Iowa.

Be it remembered, that the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa, on the 7th day of February, 1899, inspected and examined an interlocking switch system or safety device equipped and to be operated jointly by the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company, at or near Ottumwa station, in the county of Wapello and state of Iowa, and at a point where each of said railways crosses the other at grade, for the purpose of rendering it safe for engines and trains to pass over such crossing without stopping, and the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa, on the 7th day of February, 1899, approved the equipment of such interlocking switch system or safety device as aforesaid.

Done under the hand and seal of the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa, and the secretary thereof, at the city of Des Moines, state of Iowa, this 7th day of February, 1899.

No. 2004—1899.

CITIZENS OF RIVER JUNCTION,

v.

BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

} *Petition for telegraph operator.*

Petition filed February 18, 1899.

To the Honorable Board of Railroad Commissioners of Iowa:

GENTLEMEN—The undersigned citizens and residents of Johnson county, Iowa, who reside near the station called River Junction in said county, and who transact business in connection with the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company at said place, would respectfully show your honorable body that said station, to-wit, River Junction, is one at which considerable business is transacted, stock and grain shipped to various points in and out of the state, and considerable public business of such character is transacted with said company at said place.

That for many years said railway company, to-wit, the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company, have employed, kept and maintained a telegraph operator at said place in order to transact business for the public generally; that within the last year past said company have failed and neglected to keep a telegraph operator to transact such business as the public may want to do; that by reason thereof great inconvenience in doing business at said place has been brought about, and that an operator is greatly needed at said



place, the country around said station being thickly settled and much business is being transacted thereat.

Your petitioners would pray your honorable body that such action be had as in your power, under and by virtue of the laws of the state, asking and requiring that said company above mentioned procure and keep a telegraph operator at said station to transact such business as the public needs and may demand.

All of which is respectfully submitted to you for such consideration as the same merits.

Dated January 10, 1899.

(Signed)

HENRY WALKER,  
ELI FOUNTAIN,  
E. D. PORTER,  
and forty-two others.

The complaint was taken up at once with the respondent railway company, and Mr. W. P. Brady, general agent, wrote the board substantially as follows:

"I would state that Mr. G. A. Goodell, our superintendent, had an interview with many of the parties who signed the petition for telegraph facilities at this station, which you forwarded to this company under date of February 20th, last, and headvised that the majority of them expressed themselves as being satisfied with the telephone connection that had been arranged between River Junction and Lone Tree, a station six miles east of this one.

"Our business is not heavy at River Junction and the present agent, who is not an operator, has been in our service for the past twenty years at that point, and should telegraph service be insisted on, it would involve his removal and the appointment of a man familiar with telegraphy. It would seem from the results of Mr. Goodell's investigation, that the majority of the residents in that vicinity are satisfied with the present telephone connection."

Under date of August 11th, Mr. E. D. Porter, one of the petitioners, wrote the board that at the time the telephone was put in it was the understanding it was to be only a trial; that they had tried it and were not satisfied, and that they still asked and demanded telegraph service. On same date Mr. Eli Fountain, another petitioner, said: "As to myself, I do not have any great amount of telegraphing to do, and no telephoning, and I say give us a telegraph."

The matter was the subject of further correspondence, the petitioners still insisting on telegraph service, and on March 8, 1899, the commission, after due notice, visited River Junction for the purpose of inspecting the town and surrounding country, and hearing such statements as interested parties might wish to make concerning the case.

Subsequent to the hearing at River Junction, a petition was received by the commissioners containing something over fifty signatures, and stating that:

We, the undersigned residents of River Junction and vicinity, hereby take pleasure in stating to your honorable body that H. B. McCullough, the present agent of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railway, at that point, has occupied this position for a number of years, and that in our dealings with him we have found him to be an accommodating employee of the company in all respects. We also believe that the telephone service that now connects the town of River Junction with Lone Tree, affords ample facility for the transaction of all business that could be made tributary to that point at present; and we further believe we should not enjoy the same facilities for making hasty calls for physicians at Lone Tree free of charge, as we do by telephone.

(Signed)

WM. T. KELSO,  
And fifty-four others.

In sending this petition to the board, a letter from the agent, Mr. McCullough, to Mr. W. P. Brady was enclosed therewith. This letter states substantially that every man in the town of River Junction except four or five had signed the petition; that Mr. John Kirkpatrick, whose name is on the petition,

had bought more grain at that station than all River Junction buyers combined, and it was all bought from parties over the telephone since it was put in; that Messrs. Frank Rayner, Jones Evans and George Miller, stock buyers, use the telephone daily and are well satisfied with the service, and all say that they could not do without the 'phone; that their names would be found on petition for telegraph service, but they signed that before the telephone was put in; others signing the original petition had signed the one indorsing the present service for the same reason.

Concerning the petition just quoted, Mr. E. D. Porter wrote the board saying: "We think this petition should not be taken into consideration as to the stock buyers; they are from Lone Tree, and are interested in that place and not here. All but a very few of the signatures are from men who do business no place and with no one. But one business man here signed it, that being W. T. Kelso, who is a man that is always opposed to the building up of any kind of an enterprise."

River Junction is a small village in Johnson county, containing some forty inhabitants, and the ordinary business of such a town is transacted there. The railway company states that at no time has the company ever employed an operator there, although an instrument was placed there at one time to accommodate the daughter of their agent, who was learning telegraphy, and for a time, to assist her father, acted in the capacity of operator, but at no time did the fees of the office amount to more than \$1.40 per month from this service. The representative of the railway company stated that at a number of small stations similar to River Junction telephone service had been established with the most gratifying results, and furnished the following list of such stations:

"Waverly Junction with Waverly.  
Roots Siding with Clarksville.  
Adams with Nichols.  
River Junction with Lone Tree.  
Hills Siding with Iowa City.  
Cedar Valley Quarry with Plato.  
Neels with McCausland.  
Martins with McCausland.  
Black Hawk with Davenport.  
Toddville with Center Point.  
Otterville with Independence.  
Brainard with West Union.  
Alto Siding with Palmer."

While the complaint is directed toward the telephone service at River Junction, the most serious fault seems to be found with the agent and his manner of conducting the business of the company at that point.

This complaint was met, to some extent at least, by the counter petition endorsing the administration of Mr. McCullough. The commissioners do not feel that they would have the right, under the circumstances in this case, to recommend the removal of the agent now employed by the railway company at River Junction.

The telephone at this station is kept in the room where the agent is located, and no privacy is possible in sending messages. The agent stated, however, that he would leave the room at any time when so requested by parties desiring to use the telephone. It would seem to the board that this arrangement would hardly be a desirable one, and recommend to the railway company that the telephone be



enclosed, as soon as possible, in a small booth, or room, that could be entirely closed, and made practically sound proof, in order that parties desiring to use the telephone could do so with privacy.

The commissioners believe this arrangement would be for the best interests of all concerned, and bring about a more satisfactory condition of affairs at this station, and the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company is so informed. When the small room or booth is provided for telephone at River Junction, as suggested, this case will be regarded closed.

DES MOINES, Iowa, August 8, 1899.

(NOTE—The railway company complied with the recommendation of the board.)

#### No. 2005—1899.

In the matter of the petition of the Chicago Great Western Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds at Oelwein.

In the matter of the petition of the Chicago Great Western Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds in the city of Oelwein, state of Iowa, the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa do hereby certify that, upon the application of the Chicago Great Western Railway company to this board, stating the desire of said company to condemn the property hereinafter more particularly described for additional depot grounds for the use of said company, the commissioners proceeded, in conformity with law, to examine into the matter of said application, and do hereby certify that, in the opinion of the board of railroad commissioners, the additional lands described in said application are necessary for the reasonable transaction of the business, present and prospective, of such railway company, to-wit:

Commencing at the southwest corner of lot three (3), block three (3), in Bennett's addition to the town of Oelwein, Fayette county, Iowa, thence east to the southeast corner of said lot three (3), thence north on the east line of said lot three (3) one hundred and ten (110) feet, thence southwesterly in a straight line to place of beginning, in so far as the undivided three-fourths interest held therein by D. T. Corkery, J. W. Corkery and Lizzie E. Gallagher.

In witness whereof, the said board have caused this certificate to be executed and duly signed and attested by its secretary, with instructions that the same be filed with the clerk of the district court of Fayette county, state of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa, March 8, 1899.

#### No. 2005—1899. Supplemental.

In re petition of the Chicago Great Western Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds at Oelwein, Iowa.

In the matter of the petition of the Chicago Great Western Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds in the city of Oelwein, state of Iowa, the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa do hereby certify that upon the application of the Chicago Great Western Railway company to this board, stating the desire of said company to condemn the property, hereinafter more particularly described, for additional depot grounds, for the use of said company, the commissioners proceeded in conformity with law to examine into the matter of said application, and do hereby certify that,

in the opinion of the board of railroad commissioners, the additional lands described herein being the property described in said application, are necessary for the reasonable transaction of the business, present and prospective, of such railway company, to-wit:

Commencing at the southwest corner of lot three (3), block three (3), Bennett's addition to Oelwein, Fayette county, Iowa, thence east to the southeast corner of said lot three (3), thence north on the east line of said lot three (3) one hundred and ten (110) feet, thence southwesterly in a straight line to place of beginning; also, lot one (1), block four (4), in Bennett's addition to Oelwein, Fayette county, Iowa.

In witness whereof the said board of railroad commissioners have caused this certificate to be executed and duly signed and attested by its secretary, with instructions that the same be filed with the clerk of the district court of Fayette county, state of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa, March 16, 1899.

#### No. 2006—1899.

In the matter of approval of an interlocking switch system on line of Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway company, at west end of drawbridge over the Mississippi river at Fort Madison, Iowa, to be used in connection with the operation of said drawbridge.

Be it remembered, that the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa, on the 23d day of June, 1899, inspected and examined an interlocking switch system or safety device equipped and to be operated by the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway company, at or near Fort Madison, Iowa, at a point on the line of said railway where it approaches the drawbridge over the Mississippi river, which said drawbridge is used by said railway company for the passage of its trains over and across the Mississippi river, for the purpose of rendering it safe for engines and trains to pass over the said bridge from the west without stopping, and the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa, on the 23d day of June, 1899, approved the equipment of such interlocking switch system or safety device as aforesaid; however, the speed of trains approaching and passing over the derail should not exceed twenty miles per hour.

Done under the hand and seal of the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa, by the secretary thereof, at the city of Des Moines, Iowa, this 1st day of July, 1899.

#### No. 2007—1899.

In re petition of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds at Estherville, Iowa.

In the matter of the petition of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company, for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds in the city of Estherville, state of Iowa, the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa do hereby certify that, upon the application of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company to this board stating the desire of said company to condemn the property hereinafter more particularly



described for additional depot grounds for the use of said company, the commissioners proceeded in conformity with law to examine into the matter of said application, and do hereby certify that, in the opinion of the board of railroad commissioners, the additional lands described herein, being the property described in said application, are necessary for the reasonable transaction of the business, present and prospective, of such railway company, to-wit:

Lots two (2) and three (3), in block sixty-one (61), of Estherville, Emmet county, Iowa.

In witness whereof the said board of railroad commissioners have caused this certificate to be executed and duly signed and attested by its secretary, with instruction that the same be filed with the clerk of the district court of Emmet county, state of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa, July 7, 1899.

No. 2008—1899.

In re petition of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds at Vinton, Iowa.

In the matter of the petition of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds in the city of Vinton, state of Iowa, the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa do hereby certify that upon the application of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company to this board stating the desire of said company to condemn the property hereinafter more particularly described, for additional depot grounds for the use of said company, the commissioners proceeded, in conformity with law, to examine into the matter of said application, and do hereby certify that, in the opinion of the board of railroad commissioners, the additional lands described herein, being the property described in said application, are necessary for the reasonable transaction of the business, present and prospective, of such railway company, to-wit:

Lots seven (7) and eight (8), in block six (6), Tilford's addition to Vinton, Benton county, Iowa.

In witness whereof the said board of railroad commissioners have caused this certificate to be executed and duly signed and attested by its secretary, with instructions that the same be filed with the clerk of the district court of Benton county, state of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa, June 26, 1899.

No. 2009—1899.

E. L. BLACKMORE AND OTHERS, APLINGTON,

v.

Stopping fast train at Aplington.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY.

Complaint filed July 4, 1898.

#### DECISION OF COMMISSIONERS.

E. L. Blackmore, claiming to represent certain of the inhabitants of the town of Aplington, of Butler county, Iowa, presented to the board of railroad commis-

sioners a petition demanding that the Illinois Central Railroad company be compelled to stop its through night passenger trains at that station, and alleging that such trains had, within a short time prior thereto, made regular stops at such station for many years, and that, under the present management and operation, as shown by its time table or schedule, such trains were required to stop only for passengers and baggage where the destination thereof was east of Waterloo and west of Fort Dodge, stations upon said line of railway, and also for the accommodation of passengers desiring to stop at Aplington, having purchased tickets or having taken passage upon said trains outside of and beyond the stations of Waterloo and Fort Dodge.

The complaint was, in the usual and ordinary manner, submitted to the proper officials of the railroad company for its consideration and reply. Within a reasonable time the railroad company made reply to said complaint and declined to comply with the demands of the petition or otherwise change or modify the running arrangements then in force respecting said through passenger night trains. It was contended by the railroad company that the trains aforesaid were fast through trains between Chicago, within the state of Illinois, and Sioux City, within the state of Iowa, and making close running connections with other through trains, and that such trains were the only through passenger trains so operated between the points aforesaid by said railroad company not making regular daily stops at the town of Aplington; that it is now providing reasonable and adequate train service for the traveling public, including the inhabitants of the town of Aplington; that it has in operation, exclusive of the night trains, four passenger trains daily upon its line of railway passing through the town of Aplington, making regular stops, and that, in addition, three freight trains daily upon which passengers have the right and privilege of being carried; that the passenger trains were so operated that reasonable passenger service was extended to the traveling public.

The board being familiar with the ordinary conditions then existing at Aplington, the number of inhabitants and the general character of business of the town and surrounding community, and having knowledge of the number of trains each way in operation daily upon such line of railway, submitted in a general and informal way the opinion of the board with reference to the complaint, and to some extent its views respecting the same, and informing the person who assumes, at least, to represent the town of Aplington, that if, in his opinion, it was desirable, the board would go to Aplington and make an additional investigation.

The board having received a communication that such hearing was desirable, Commissioners Palmer and Mowry, together with the secretary, upon due notice being given all parties, went to Aplington and held a public hearing, extending to all parties an opportunity to make such statements as they or each of them might desire. At this hearing little or no new facts were disclosed which were not fully known to the commissioners. It was contended on the part of those present, or at least some of them, that if these trains should stop at Aplington it would give those who might have occasion to go to intermediate points between Ft. Dodge and Waterloo, one additional train each way daily; and that those wishing to visit neighboring towns are required to go by team.

It was further claimed that it was an act of discrimination on the part of the railway company against the people of Aplington; that these trains having for many years made regular daily stops at this station, that the railway company



had no right or authority to make the change in question, or in fact any change, whereby these trains should not be compelled to make regular daily stops. Another objection made was that the passenger trains operated between Waterloo and Ft. Dodge, which had been put upon this line to better accommodate the local passenger traffic, was detrimental to the business interests of Aplington; that it gave an opportunity to purchase merchandise at other points, and two or more of the citizens expressed a desire that such trains should be, for that reason, withdrawn and abandoned by the railroad company.

We find the following to be substantially the undisputed facts: That the town of Aplington has about 500 inhabitants; that it has no railway facilities or advantages except such as may be provided for it by the Illinois Central Railroad company; that the distance between Parkersburg and Aplington is about five miles, and that Parkersburg is nearly east therefrom; that Austinville is about five miles west and the town of Ackley about ten miles west, all by rail, and all upon the line of said railway; that a daily passenger train passes through Aplington, Sundays excepted, going west at 11:44 A. M., and another going east at 5:02 P. M., these trains being through trains between Sioux City and Chicago and making connections with trains upon its own line of railway, as well as others, at the last named cities; that another daily passenger train is in operation, Sundays excepted, between Ft. Dodge and Waterloo, which has been in operation since the night trains in question have not made Aplington station a regular stopping point, passing through Aplington going east at 9:53 A. M., and going west at 6:47 P. M.; that during the daytime there are one or more freight trains, having the right to carry passengers, passing daily each way.

We find that the trains in question, that is, the daily midnight trains, do not stop at Aplington, except upon signal, and then only for passengers and baggage destined east of Waterloo or west of Ft. Dodge, except in case of sickness or other emergency; that the distance between Ft. Dodge and Waterloo is about 100 miles; that the trains aforesaid pass through Aplington as follows: The east-bound train at 1:02 A. M. and the west-bound train at 12:33 midnight; that these trains are operated principally for the accommodation and convenience of the passenger traffic between the state of Iowa and other states, and that the business carried on and conducted thereon and thereby is largely interstate; that these trains are composed of sleeping cars, passenger coaches and mail and express cars, and that in the operation of said trains between the city of Chicago, within the state of Illinois, and Sioux City, within the state of Iowa, no change is made in said trains or the coaches or cars thereof, except change of engines; that through mail and express is carried and transported by said trains between this and other states; that the actual running time of said trains, stops excluded, is substantially fifty-five miles per hour; that between Sioux City and Dubuque the trains in question do not stop at towns or stations of the size or population of Aplington, or of less population, unless at railroad crossings, under any different conditions than at Aplington; that the people of Aplington are given by the railroad company the same advantages and enjoy the same privileges and benefits of towns of a similar size that are extended to other communities within this state along the lines of this company, so far as passenger service may be involved.

While it is not conceded by the complainant, we find that the passenger business at this station has substantially increased since the operation of the trains between Waterloo and Ft. Dodge.

The foregoing are the material and pertinent facts, as we deem them, necessary to a fair understanding of the matter in controversy.

We regard the question involved in this case of great public importance, and we regret that the representative of the people of Aplington, apparently, at least, does not seem to comprehend the far-reaching influence or bearing which this controversy may have upon the transportation question in this state. We may justly infer from his attitude and declarations that but one interest, and only one, should be considered, and that the interests of the public should be ignored; that through fast trains should not be encouraged, or even permitted, if, for any cause, any number of people should be discommoded or discomfited thereby, regardless of the great number that may, through necessity or otherwise, require and stand in need of rapid and safe transit. The railways of to-day are expected, and in fact should be required, to furnish reasonable rapid transit to and from the great commercial centers. A railway company which does not provide, within a reasonable time and under ordinary conditions, suitable, proper and safe equipment and roadbed for the purpose of accommodating the through public travel greatly impairs the wealth and prosperity of the country through which such line may be located, and such community, in the opinion of this board, would have just cause for requiring proper through service. The people along the line of the Illinois Central are entitled to a through and reasonably rapid passenger service. It is the duty of the common carrier to give reasonable accommodation and passenger service to both classes of its patrons, the local as well as the through passenger.

It is conceded in this controversy, and if not it is true, that this railroad company has in operation upon this line six passenger trains every twenty-four hours, Sunday excepted in some of them, four of which stop at all stations, carry local as well as through passengers, and only one train each way provides more especially for the care, comfort and convenience of the through passenger. This train between Sioux City and Chicago runs at the average speed of about fifty-five miles per hour, not stopping at stations of the population of Aplington or less, unless for through passengers whose destination is east of Waterloo or west of Ft. Dodge. Is this service reasonable? If so, then the board cannot interfere with the management or the operation of this train in this regard. The public holds the railway companies responsible, and requires of them a high degree of care in protecting the passenger from danger or injury. We cannot say, if we had the authority so to do, that this train should be operated at any higher rate of speed, or that it would be reasonable to do anything that would prevent through passengers from arriving at Chicago later than 10:10 A. M. or Sioux City later than 7 A. M. These are matters that we ought not to interfere with unless for very excellent reasons, and it has been questioned whether we have any jurisdiction over a train of this character where other and reasonable service is given the public, which will be referred to later in this decision.

In referring to the running time of this train, we are of the opinion that, unless a roadbed and equipment are in proper and excellent condition, due regard for the safety of the traveling public would not be subserved in requiring a too high rate of speed.

In passing upon this question, we are to consider the effect of making an order in this case requiring these fast trains to stop at this station, and what effect it would have upon passengers and public carried upon the through trains upon this line. If all towns of the size of Aplington may have the right to compel through trains to stop thereat upon this line, it would soon destroy all rapid transit within this state upon this line, and if this rule is applied to this railway, it would be



our duty to apply it to all railways in the state whenever an application was made to do so where the conditions were similar. In fact, an attempt was made in this case to induce other towns of the size of Aplington to join in this controversy and require these trains to stop at such points.

The question of interfering with interstate commerce and traffic is clearly within this case, but as it has not been presented or argued by either party we deem it advisable not to consider or decide it upon that ground.

When a railway company carrying traffic, whether freight or passengers, between two or more states, upon interstate trains, and reasonable service by the railway company is provided for the state and local traffic, there may be a serious question whether the state authorities, either through the courts or commissioners, have the right to retard or in any other way unreasonably interfere with such trains. We are not unmindful of the right of the state to exercise its police regulations with reference to the manner of the operation of such interstate trains or in any other reasonable way, but from a careful reading of the case of the Illinois Central Railway company v. the State of Illinois, reported in vol. 163, page 142, of the U. S. Reports, and the cases therein cited, as well as others, it would seem that the court is not disposed to permit unreasonable interference with the operation of trains carrying interstate business, and that it will protect such traffic whether carried by freight or passenger trains, from any undue or unreasonable regulations.

We have reached the conclusion in this case that we ought not to make any order therein; that the railroad company in operating six passenger trains through the town of Aplington, daily, Sunday excepted, four of which carry both through and local passengers, and two of which carry through passengers to all points where such trains stop east of Waterloo and west of Ft. Dodge, is extending to the people reasonable service, and considering the service upon the freight trains each way the railway company is not discriminating against the town of Aplington or that locality. To make the order contended for by the person who claims to represent the people of Aplington, in this case, would in time require these interstate trains carrying through passengers, as well as mail and express, to stop at about all the towns between Sioux City and Dubuque, within the state. It would thereby practically destroy all through connections with other trains and would impede and interfere with all passengers who might be obliged to travel upon these trains upon this line of railway. The actual running time upon this line of railway, considering the condition of the roadbed and track, ought not to be increased, at least sufficiently to make up for all local delays and stops which would be occasioned thereby, if we should make the order asked for.

Each case must necessarily be governed and controlled largely by the conditions existing and affecting the immediate locality and the demands of the public. There might be conditions that would require a different ruling, but in this case the trains carrying through and local passengers, and which make regular stops at Aplington, pass at such hours in the daytime as would seem to give reasonable accommodation to the public, and at a seasonable time.

It is the unanimous decision of the board that it ought not to interfere with the service upon this line of railroad at this time, and that to do so would do a great injustice to the traveling public generally, and would be establishing a precedent that might in time, if carried into effect, work a great hardship and great inconvenience to those requiring reasonably rapid transit upon this line of railway, as well as upon all others throughout the state. It must not be under-

stood, however, that the decision reached in this case should be applied to all through trains operated within the state or localities situated thereon. Each case, as we have stated before, must be governed largely by the existing conditions, and this board, upon proper complaint, will interfere whenever in its judgment and opinion, the railway companies are not giving to the public reasonably good local as well as through service.

Des Moines, Iowa, June 26, 1899.

No. 2010—1899.

In re petition of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds at West Liberty, Iowa.

In the matter of petition of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds in the town of West Liberty, state of Iowa, the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa do hereby certify that upon the application of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company to this board stating the desire of said company to condemn the property hereinafter more particularly described for additional depot grounds, for the use of said company, the commissioners proceeded in conformity with law to examine into the matter of said application, and do hereby certify that, in the opinion of a majority of the board of railroad commissioners, the additional lands described herein, being the property described in the application, are necessary for the reasonable transaction of the business, present and prospective, of said railway company, to-wit:

A strip of land 25 feet in width over, across, and through out lot 10, in the county auditor's survey of the subdivision of out lots of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 12, township 78, north of range 4 west, containing about fifteen one-hundredths of an acre. The north boundary line of said 25-foot strip intersecting the west line of said out lot 10, about 55 feet south of the northwest corner thereof and intersecting the east line of said out lot 10 about 73 feet south of the point where the east boundary line of said out lot intersects the southwest boundary line of the right of way of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railway.

Also, a strip of land 25 feet in width across the north part of out lot 8 in the county auditor's survey of the subdivision above described. The northerly line of said 25 foot strip intersecting the west line of said out lot 8, about 73 feet south of where the west line of said out lot intersects the southwesterly boundary line of the right of way of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railway, and intersects the northeasterly boundary line of said out lot 8, about 130 feet southeasterly from the point of intersection of the west boundary line of said out lot 8, and the southwesterly boundary line of the right of way of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railway, containing about six one-hundredths of an acre.

Also all that lot or parcel of land situated in the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 12, township 78, north of range 4 west, described as follows:

Beginning on the west line of said section 12, at the point of intersection thereof of the north line of the original right of way of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railway; thence east along the south line of the piece of ground now



belonging to the said company 391 feet, more or less, to the west line of the station grounds of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company; thence south along the west line of said station grounds of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railway 139 feet, more or less, to the north line of another piece of ground now belonging to said Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company; thence west 232 feet to the north boundary line of the original right of way of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company; thence northwesterly to the point of beginning. Containing about one acre of land.

In witness whereof the said majority of the members of the board of railroad commissioners have caused this certificate to be executed and duly signed and attested by its secretary, with instructions that the same be filed with the clerk of the district court of Muscatine county, state of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa, August 4, 1899.

No 2011—1899.

In the matter of the petition of the Iowa Central & Western Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds at Algona, Iowa.

In the matter of the petition of the Iowa Central & Western Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds in the town of Algona, Iowa, the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa do hereby certify that upon the application of the Iowa Central & Western Railway company to this board, stating the desire of said company to condemn the property hereinafter more particularly described for additional depot grounds for the use of said company, the commissioners proceeded, in conformity with law, to examine into the matter of said application, and do hereby certify that, in the opinion of the board of railroad commissioners, the additional lands described in said application are necessary for the reasonable transaction of the business, present and prospective, of such railway company, to-wit:

Lots Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7, in block 148, in Call's addition to the said town of Algona; lots Nos. 3 and 4, in said block 148, in Call's addition to the town of Algona; lot No. 8, in the same block; lots Nos. 1, 2 and 8, in block 149, in Call's addition to the said town of Algona; blocks 150 and 151, in said Call's addition to the town of Algona, and lots 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, in block 152 of Call's addition to the town of Algona.

In witness whereof the said board has caused this certificate to be executed, and duly signed and attested by its secretary, with instructions that the same be filed with the clerk of the district court of Kossuth county, state of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa, September 20, 1899.

No. 2011—1899. (Supplemental.)

In the matter of the petition of the Iowa Central & Western Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds at Algona, Iowa.

In the matter of the petition of the Iowa Central & Western Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds in the town of Algona, Iowa, the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa, do

hereby certify that upon the application of the Iowa Central & Western Railway company to this board, stating the desire of said company to condemn the property hereinafter more particularly described for additional depot grounds for the use of said company, the commissioners proceeded, in conformity with law, to examine into the matter of said application, and do hereby certify that, in the opinion of the board of railroad commissioners, the additional lands described in said application are necessary for the reasonable transaction of the business, present and prospective, of such railway company, to-wit:

Lots 3, 4 and 5 in block 149, lots 6 and 7 in block 149, and lot 2 in block 152, all of said lots being in Call's addition to the town of Algona, Iowa.

In witness whereof the said board has caused this certificate to be executed and duly signed and attested by its secretary, with instructions that the same be filed with the clerk of the district court of Kossuth county, state of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa, October 20, 1899.

No. 2012—1899.

In the matter of the petition of the Gowrie & Northwestern Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds at Manson, Iowa.

In the matter of the petition of the Gowrie & Northwestern Railway company for permission to condemn certain lands for additional depot grounds in the town of Manson, state of Iowa, the board of railroad commissioners of the state of Iowa do hereby certify that upon the application of the Gowrie & Northwestern Railway company to this board, stating the desire of said company to condemn the property, hereinafter more particularly described, for additional depot grounds for the use of said company, the commissioners proceeded in conformity with law to examine into the matter of said application, and do hereby certify that, in the opinion of the board of railroad commissioners, the additional lands described in said application are necessary for the reasonable transaction of the business, present and prospective, of such railway company, to-wit:

Block 21 of the fifth addition to the town of Manson, except the west two acres thereof.

The west 250 feet of lot 4, in block 20 of the fifth addition to the town of Manson.

Lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 of Ebersole's subdivision of lot 1, block 20 of the fifth addition to the town of Manson.

Lots 11, 12 and 14, and the east  $\frac{1}{2}$  of lot 13, in block 5 of Willey's first addition to the town of Manson.

Lot 12, and the west 6 feet of lot 13, and the east 12 feet of lot 11 of R. A. Horton's subdivision of block 6 of Willey's second addition to the town of Manson.

Lots 2, 3 and 4, R. A. Horton's subdivision of block 6 of Willey's second addition to the town of Manson.

Also, a tract of land described as follows: Commencing on the north line of block 6, of Willey's second addition to the town of Manson, 429 feet from the center of Baltimore avenue, thence north 300 feet, thence east 250 feet, thence south 300 feet, thence west along the north line of said block 6, 250 feet to place of beginning.



In witness whereof the said board have caused this certificate to be executed and duly signed and attested by its secretary, with instructions that the same be filed with the clerk of the district court of Calhoun county, state of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa, September 27, 1899.

---

---

## CASES CLOSED BY CORRESPONDENCE.

---

---



## CASES CLOSED BY CORRESPONDENCE.

No. 2013—1899.

OLINE BROS., PAGE CENTER,

v.

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAIL-  
ROAD COMPANY.} *Petition for agent.*

Filed January 3, 1898.

Messrs. Oline Bros., Page Center, wrote the board stating that the citizens of that place had requested the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company to employ an agent at that station; that when the road was built the farmers donated some land and money to the company on condition that an agent be kept there for twenty years; that an agent was only employed there a few years; that the town was a small one with but one store, although doing quite a lot of business.

The commissioners called the attention of the railroad company to the case and it is understood that several attempts were made by the citizens and the railroad company to arrive at some mutual and satisfactory agreement without success.

On February 16, 1899, Mr. C. M. Levey, superintendent Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company, wrote the board concerning this case. The board deem it best to print the same in full, as it presents in detail the position of the railway company in the case:

"Your letter of January 14th addressed to Mr. W. C. Brown, general manager, with copy of letter from Oline Bros., of Page Center, Iowa, asking that an agent be placed at that point, was referred to me.

"With special reference made to statement by Oline Bros., will say that no promises with regard to maintaining an agent at Page Center have ever been made, neither was there an agreement at the time the road was built to keep an agent there for twenty years. There is only one store at Page Center. Oline Bros. run this and they, themselves, the buyers of hogs and grain mentioned in their letter.

"When this branch was first built through Page Center, an agent was placed at that point and kept there for five years, and I am informed that the business during that period was not sufficient to justify the company in maintaining an agent. At that time the land naturally tributary to Page Center was under cultivation, and produced as much business for a railroad as it does to-day, and, if the station could not be made to pay then, there is nothing in the condition now to warrant any more business being transacted at that point. The carload business for the past three years is as follows: 1896, forty-six cars; 1897, fifty-three.



cars; 1898, eighty-nine cars. The grain shipments during 1898 were heavier than usual on account of corn having been cribbed and held over from previous years.

"One alleged source of complaint is inconvenience in ordering cars and getting information about trains and other matters; also, that the section foreman has the key to the depot and is only there at train time, and occasionally small shipments are received which it is not convenient to take away from the station promptly, and if people come there at other hours than train time the section foreman is not there.

"To overcome this difficulty, we have made this proposition to Oline Bros.: That we will give them telephone service between their store at Page Center and our agent's office in Clarinda free of all expense to them, and will also furnish them pass between Page Center and Clarinda during the time the arrangement is in effect, provided they will keep an eye on our business at Page Center, and open the depot and deliver freight that may be received.

"We would propose to have two keys to the depot waiting-room, one to be kept by the section foreman, who will keep the room clean, and the other key kept at Oline Bros.' store, so that they could have the waiting-room open at train time.

"There would be some objections to two parties having keys to the wareroom. We would, therefore, propose to have only one key to the wareroom and put this in charge of Oline Bros.

"As nearly all of the business transacted at Page Center is done by Oline Bros., it looks to us as though this arrangement should be eminently satisfactory to them, as it would enable them at any time to order cars and get information from Clarinda about trains, rates, etc.

"The fact that Clarinda is the county seat and a large and important town, the business that might otherwise be done at Page Center goes to Clarinda, and an agent at Page Center would not change this in the slightest.

"The arrangement suggested is, I understand, satisfactory to Oline Bros., with the exception that they want to be permitted to collect freight charges, etc. This we have declined, because it would necessitate a full set of station reports being made, besides it would be necessary to have them give us bond, as it is required from all employees who handle money, and, in fact, would involve more trouble and expense than the business would justify, besides making so much extra work for Oline Bros. that they would not long be satisfied to do it, as the reports would have to be made and sent in, whether any business was transacted or not."

The complainants, who were furnished copy of Mr. Levey's letter addressed further communications to the board concerning this complaint, and on March 14th, the commissioners disposed of the case by writing the complainants substantially as follows: That the board had reached the conclusion that under all the circumstances it believed the suggestions made in the letter of Mr. C. M. Levey, superintendent Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company, under date of February 16, 1899, should be put into effect and given a fair trial; that if their experience, after such trial, led them to believe that reasonably fair and adequate service was not furnished by the railroad company at that point, upon a further application to the board it would make a personal inspection and examination of the condition existing there and would give all interested parties an opportunity to be present at such hearing; but that from the best information that the board then had, it believed it would be found that this service would

meet the business requirements at that point, and the case would be considered closed until a further application was made.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.

No. 2014-1899.

A. E. HOLLINGSWORTH, DUNREATH,

v.

Minimum weight the marked capacity of car.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD CO.

Complaint filed January 28, 1898.

On the above date Mr. A. E. Hollingsworth, representing the Success Coal company, of Dunreath, Iowa, called at the office of the board and stated that his company was engaged in shipping coal via the Des Moines, Northern & Western, to points on the Illinois Central railroad, and that while other companies, notably the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and the North-Western and Milwaukee receive these cars at actual weight, as also the Wabash in bringing this coal from the Dunreath mines to Des Moines, yet upon reaching the Illinois Central that company set the weight up to the marked capacity of the car regardless of the amount in the car; that the coal is light and bulky, more so than ordinary soft coal, and that in consequence they were unable to load more than fifty to fifty-two thousand pounds on a sixty thousand pound car, and other amounts in proportion to the length or capacity of the car, without loading so full as to cause the coal to fall off and waste in transit; that such action is discriminative and detrimental to their business, and the complainant asked the board to intervene in his behalf; that he has put in claim for the amount of the overcharge thus accruing, but that thus far the company has returned such claim disallowed.

The attention of Mr. J. T. Harahan, second vice-president of the company, was called to the complaint, and on February 12th he wrote the board concerning this case, as follows:

"Referring again to your favor of 4th inst., in reference to complaint of the Success Coal company, of Dunreath, Iowa, as to overcharge on coal, I have looked into this matter and find that we have received only one claim from the Success Coal company in the past year. All the papers in that claim were returned to J. N. Tittmore, general freight agent of the Des Moines, Northern & Western railroad, on the 2d inst. with advice that we would share in the overcharge on account of the weight. Our freight claim agent's file does not show the particulars of the case, but his recollection is the capacity weight of the car was charged, while the papers indicated that the actual weight of the contents was less. As it was a foreign car and the coal company claimed they loaded all they could, a reduction was made to the actual weight.

"In reference to the statement made by Mr. Hollingsworth that it is the custom of this company to set up the weight to the marked capacity of the car regardless of the amount in the car, I beg to advise that our rule is that soft coal be billed at actual weights furnished by the miners, subject to the supervision of the Western Railway Weighing association, with the marked capacity of the car as a minimum, except that on shipments loaded in our cars of thirty tons capacity the minimum is twenty-eight tons on lump coal and twenty-seven tons on fine coal. The same rule applies to foreign cars coming on our line from other roads



Of course, if shippers produce satisfactory evidence to show that foreign cars loaded up to their full capacity do not hold their minimum, we refund the excess freight charges. This is the understanding with the mines off the line of our road."

Mr. Hollingsworth, on April 15th, advised the board that his claim had been paid.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 1, 1899.

No. 2015-1899.

S. B. FRUM, SHELBY,

V.

CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Application for coal house site.*

Complaint filed April 5, 1898.

Mr. Frum wrote the board on April 4th that he had been trying to get a location for a coal house at Shelby on the tracks of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company; that there was but one dealer at that place besides himself; that he was greatly handicapped by having to haul coal and throw into houses located off the track. The matter was taken up with the railway company, and it was supposed by the board that an adjustment had been reached. However, on March 23, 1899, Mr. Frum stated that he had no location and still desired one.

The case was reopened, and, after some further correspondence, Mr. W. H. Hobbs, superintendent, wrote the board that Mr. Frum was now located upon their sidetrack; that he had occupied a coal house sixteen feet long and twelve feet wide, and had a sand bin eight feet long, which took up all the room he was allotted. Mr. Hobbs sent a copy of the lease for this location, and, the complaint being satisfied, the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.

No. 2016-1899.

R. H. SMITH ET AL., BY G. C. HOOVER,  
ATTORNEY, WEST BRANCH, AND  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, CEDAR  
COUNTY,

V.

BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Dangerous highway crossing.*

Petition filed April 15, 1898.

The following petition was filed with the board:

To the Right Honorable Board of Railroad Commissioners:

We, the undersigned petitioners, respectfully request the right honorable board of commissioners to cause the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railroad to put in and maintain a good and safe crossing where the public road crosses the line of said Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railroad, which crossing is now situated about three-quarters of a mile

north of the incorporated town of West Branch, Iowa, and being the first crossing outside of the limits of the said incorporated town of West Branch, for the reason that said crossing is now dangerous and a menace to the public, as is more fully explained in the petition accompanying this.

R. H. Smith, I. Hemingway, R. F. Schofield, Angley Smith, S. G. Ellyson, C. M. Gruwell, Mrs. G. S. Gruwell, John Wertsbaugh, F. P. Morse, Harry Vincent, Ed. Saylor, John Devang, William P. Negus, F. B. Adair and sixty others.

Mr. G. C. Hoover, attorney-at-law, West Branch, in sending the petition, stated that several accidents had happened at the crossing in question; that it was a daily menace to the traveling public; that the angle of the road at the crossing is such that a team is obliged to go along the right of way some distance in approaching the same; that a team approaching from the south is unable to see an approaching train from the north on account of the high banks, which are from ten to twelve feet high; that a team crossing from the north is in even greater danger owing to the highway being some eight or nine feet lower than the roadbed of said railway, and from the fact that there is an approach to the said railroad some eight feet high, five rods long and twenty-five feet wide, leaving a ditch eight feet deep on the east of said approach to the crossing.

The complaint was sent the railway company for answer, and on May 14th Mr. W. P. Brady, general agent of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company, said he had had entire charge of the personal injuries of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railway for the last sixteen years, and that he could not recall at any time during that period an accident occurring at this crossing; that the nearest one was on November 12, 1896, when Mrs. R. H. Smith, whose horse became frightened, after she drove over the crossing, by an approaching train and threw her out, inflicting some slight injuries to her person; that it was the intention, at an early date, to make a personal investigation of the locality of this complaint.

The complainants insisted that accidents had occurred at this crossing and evidence could be furnished proving that wheels of buggies, etc., and runners of sleighs had become fast between the plank and the rail on the crossing, thus endangering the lives of the occupants and the safety of trains.

The commissioners notified all parties that they would visit the crossing in question on Thursday, June 28, 1898.

On date named the board went to the crossing, met the members of the board of supervisors and Mr. W. P. Brady, with other representatives of the railway company. They found the conditions substantially as stated in Mr. Hoover's letter and the petition, but owing to the location of the highway, saw no way to obviate the danger unless the highway should be relocated, and that the crossing as it was now constructed was perhaps no more dangerous than a great many others in the state that had been considered reasonably safe. However, the board suggested to the railway company that the approach to the crossing should be widened and an additional length of planking be placed between the rails at the crossing. This was done, as appears from letter of Mr. Brady dated October 10, 1898, wherein he says that the approach has been widened six feet and an additional length of planking put in, making three lengths of sixteen-foot plank.

As this action on the part of the railway company seems to have complied with the recommendations made by the board the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.



No 2017—1899.

TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES, WALNUT,

v.

CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.*Highway overhead crossing.*

Complaint filed June 6, 1898.

On date named, Mr. J. H. Schofield, trustee, wrote the board concerning an alleged dangerous highway crossing, known as the O'Neil cut. While the matter presented was not in the form of a complaint, yet it was taken up with the company, and on July 1st Mr. H. A. Parker, second vice-president, wrote the board, saying among other things: "Replying to your letter of June 13th to our Mr. Truesdale, regarding public highway crossing our tracks about three miles east of Walnut, known as the O'Neil cut, and a complaint of Mr. Schofield that an overhead bridge is desired and needed:

"I enclose herewith a letter signed by Mr. McFarlin, our superintendent of maintenance, giving his views of this crossing and such information as he possesses regarding negotiations which have already taken place with the road trustees on the subject. To Mr. McFarlin's letter is attached profile showing the actual crossing as it now exists, as well as some suggested crossings.

"There can be little doubt but what the road crossing, in its present condition, is not entirely safe. We do not feel that our company should be at the entire expense of putting up and maintaining an overhead bridge, should it be decided that such a bridge is a necessity; still, we believe we are willing to do what will be fair in the matter."

Mr. Parker enclosed letter from Mr. W. K. McFarlin, copy of which letter follows below:

"I enclose you blue print showing the profile of the highway at a point 100 feet to 150 feet east of the road in question.

"The road north from the crossing is practically a 9 per cent grade, and at the road the fill is quite heavy. I met the road overseers last year and proposed to them that if they would move the crossing 100 to 150 feet east and would grade the south approach we would put in the bridge and do the grading on the north side.

"I understand that they do not wish to move the road out of the section line. For the overhead bridge we have marked an 8 per cent approach on the south.

"You will note the grade on the point 100 feet east is much easier than section line. We could, of course, curve the bridge as shown in red, and help them considerable on the turn.

"The crossing is traveled quite a good deal, but not heavy, and I would not feel like running the grade out on the section line at our expense, the distance named. You will note that it is about 300 feet to the point where the grade strikes the present level of the road."

On the 6th of September, Messrs. O. B. Tilton and A. D. Backus, township trustees, together with Mr. A. E. Kincaid, township clerk, filed complaint as follows:

WALNUT, Iowa, September 3, 1898.

To the Honorable Board of Railroad Commissioners:

You are hereby notified that the railroad crossing known as the O'Neil crossing over the right of way of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railway between sections 13 and 14, township 77, range 38 (Layton township), Pottawattamie county, Iowa, is in an unsafe condition

and you are hereby earnestly requested to examine the same and require the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company to put same in a condition so that it will be safe and convenient.

A. E. KINCAID,  
Township Clerk.  
O. B. TILTON,  
A. D. BACKUS,  
Trustees.

This complaint was taken up with W. H. Truesdale, general manager of the respondent company.

The railroad company, in response, replied that the crossing was about as good as it could be made for graded crossings, and said further that they had at one time offered to build an overhead crossing if they, the township, would grade the south approach to the bridge, and on September 29th, Mr. A. E. Kincaid wrote the board as follows:

"GENTLEMEN—Replying to your favor, of the above date, in reference to the complaint laid with you as to the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company lowering the grade at O'Neil crossing. We have had a reasonable and fair crossing at the point stated. A year ago the railroad company lowered their tracks at this point so as to make the crossing very dangerous, which was done without our consent.

"Now they claim in their letter to you that they are willing to put in an overhead crossing providing the township puts in the south approach.

"The township cannot agree to that proposition, as it would cost us from \$700 to \$1,000 to put in the south approach on account of the low ground on the south side of the track, and it would be necessary to make a very heavy fill in order to meet the grade of the overhead bridge.

"The railroad company are generous in their proposition to go east a few rods from the original line, simply on account of the natural bank elevation at that point, which would make it less expensive for the railroad company to put in their bridge, but still would not lessen the expense of the south grade. It would also necessitate the township to buy a piece of land for that purpose.

"We would like if some of you gentlemen would come out and look at this matter, as you could then judge best of the justness of our claim.

"We think the railroad company should put in the overhead crossing and make all of the grade on both sides of the track, so as to leave a safe and convenient crossing for the use of the traveling public.

"By order of the trustees of Layton township."

After some further correspondence, it was decided to let the matter rest until spring, and the board fixed March 22, 1899, for an examination of the crossing and hearing of the case at Walnut, Iowa. On date named the board viewed the location of this crossing, afterward going to Walnut for such hearing as might be necessary.

It was apparent to the board that the location of this crossing was at a point more or less dangerous to the public, but, unless the highway could be removed, it would not be feasible for an overhead crossing.

On May 2, 1899, Mr. Hugo Burmeister, township clerk, wrote the board as follows:

WALNUT, Iowa, May 2, 1899.

Railroad Commissioners, Des Moines, Iowa:

GENTLEMEN—The trustees of Layton township have made the Rock Island Railway company a proposition in regard to an overhead crossing at O'Neil cut, which is:

The township to furnish the ground and right of way 100 feet east of the present crossing and the company to build and maintain, and do the grading necessary to make a good over-



head crossing. This is the proposition which we made them two weeks ago and received no reply, so we must leave the matter in your hands for adjustment. Something must be done and as soon as possible, for it is a very common thing to hear people from that neighborhood say, "I came very near getting caught this morning" And some day there will be some one caught, which may cost more than two or three new bridges.

Trusting that you will give this your earliest attention and hoping for a favorable adjustment, I am very respectfully, Yours truly,

HUGO BURMEISTER,  
Township Clerk.

This proposition was made to the railroad company, and on May 8, 1899, Mr. W. K. McFarlin, superintendent of maintenance and construction, said:

"I have your letter of May 3d enclosing letter from Mr. Hugo Burmeister, township clerk at Walnut, Iowa. I enclose you herewith a copy of letter I wrote him on April 15th in answer to his letter of April 13th. Also, I enclose his answer of April 17th, so you may see that his statement that we made no answer is not correct.

"I said that day if they would pay \$200 towards the cost of the approach and furnish right of way, we would put the overhead approach 100 or 200 feet east of the present road. Also, if they would move the road crossing far enough east so that the cut would answer for approaches, we would put the bridge in free; or if they would establish a road farther west at grade we would put it in free. I do not consider that there is travel enough on that road to justify putting in an overhead bridge on the section line.

"It would take an approach, south of the railroad, 350 feet long and over twenty feet high, at the south end of the bridge.

"That this bridge approach, unless built very wide, would be dangerous for teams on account of the approach of trains.

"I think the proposition I made them is more than fair, and for that reason did not accept their proposition of April 13th, as shown in my letter of April 15th."

On June 2, 1899, Mr. Burmeister advised the board that they could not come to an agreement and asking that the board take some action. The board on June 13th went to Chicago, called on Mr. McFarlin and obtained from him the proposition which was submitted to the authorities at Walnut on June 19th. The letter follows:

JUNE 19, 1899.

Hugo Burmeister, Esq., Township Clerk, Walnut, Iowa:

DEAR SIR—Since receiving your last communication with reference to the highway and railway crossing near Walnut, and believing there was a substantial difference between the company and the public with reference thereto, the board of railroad commissioners, for the purpose of ascertaining, if possible, whether or not an amicable and reasonable adjustment could be made between the public and the railway company, had a personal interview with the officials of the railway company in charge of this matter.

At the solicitation of the board they have made the following proposition: If the township or county authorities will move crossing 200 feet east and furnish ground for approaches, the company will do all the work; that is, fence right of way, grade approaches and furnish bridge complete, without cost to the county or township. If desired, the right of way on north side may be used for north approach without cost.

It is the opinion of the board after the investigation and inspection had at Walnut that the conditions existing at this crossing were not favorable for an overhead crossing where the highway is now located, and in view of the fact that the legal questions involved in matters of this kind are in doubt in this state, we believe in the interests of safety and certainty the proposition made by the railroad company, under all of the present conditions and contingencies, is not an unreasonable one, and we believe and hope that those in charge of this highway may, upon reflection, reach the same conclusion that the commissioners have.

We do not wish, however, to express our opinion further at this time with reference to this matter, but have only made these suggestions in what we believe to be for the best public interest and safety.

Upon submission of this proposition to the proper authorities, we are desirous that you let us know as soon as the result is known to you what action they may take in the matter.

Very respectfully,

THE BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS.  
By D. N. Lewis, Secretary.

On June 21st Mr. Burmeister responded as follows:

GENTLEMEN—Your favor of the 19th inst. received and contents noted. We do not feel that we can accept your proposition as stated, as the railroad company is in duty bound to furnish a safe crossing over their right of way, and as you very well know, their crossing at O'Neill cut is far from being safe. The proposition we made them that we would furnish right of way 100 feet east of the present crossing we think is a fair proposition. They now ask for 200 feet. Now, then, to come to an agreement we will concede them 50 feet, making 150 feet east of the present crossing to the east side of the proposed viaduct; that the township furnish right of way, and the railway company to do the grading without cost to the township, they to build the approaches and grades at their own expense; the township does not think they should spend any more than enough money to pay for the ground to get right of way on the north and south side of railroad grounds. This is positively the best proposition that we can make, and we think it is a fair one. If this is not accepted kindly advise us at once, so we will know what course to pursue, as we must have a crossing and that soon.

HUGO BURMEISTER.

Very respectfully,

Copy of this letter was sent Mr. McFarlin and he was written on July 18th that the commissioners had reached the conclusion that this crossing is in such condition that something ought to be done to finally dispose of this matter and that the company ought to accept the proposition contained in Mr. Burmeister's letter; that the case had been pending some time and there did not seem any reasonable ground for a more amicable adjustment between the company and the township.

On July 20th the board received from Mr. McFarlin an acceptance of the proposition made by the complainants, and on the same day Mr. Burmeister was so advised.

Mr. Burmeister was asked to advise the board as soon as arrangements were satisfactorily made with the railroad company for the completion of the work. Nothing, however, was heard from him and on October 23d he was again asked to state what the condition of things were. Under date of October 24th, he replied that the railroad company had men at work grading the road and that an overhead crossing would be constructed as soon as possible.

This being satisfactory to all parties, the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 3, 1899.

No. 2018—1899.

J. P. MARRON, JACKSON JUNCTION,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Wrongful ejection from train.

Complaint filed January 20, 1898.

The complaint made by Mr. Marron is herewith printed in full:

JACKSON JUNCTION, Iowa, January 19, 1898.

Railroad Commissioners, Des Moines:

I wish to inform you that, on my way from Chicago with a sick child, I was made to get off passenger train No. 1, on January 18, 1898, going west, and wait in a cold depot at Fort Atkinson for a freight. The conductor said he would put me off or carry me to Lawler, that



is six miles past where I live, and I could not get back till about noon, so I got off at the Fort and waited half an hour in a cold depot, and my child caught a bad cold. They sold me a ticket in Chicago, a first-class fare, and checked me on that train at 6 o'clock P. M. to be at home at 5 A. M. I was there a year ago and they stopped and let me off. My wife came home two days before me with the same kind of a ticket, and they made her get off at the Fort and were very saucy. It was the same man I think. He followed me in the depot to jangle with me in one way and apologize in another. He said, if I had told him at McGregor, he would have telegraphed for a permit. The idea! His run starts at McGregor. The first time he came round collecting fare I gave him my ticket. He looked at it and said, "You change cars at Calmar." "I want to stop at the Junction," I said. "I have paid for a first-class fare from Chicago to Jackson Junction. I have a sick child, and I don't want to be forced to ride in a freight and to change cars." He said that made no difference to him. "You get off or I will put you off." I am doctoring with Dr. H. R. Allen, sixth floor Masonic Temple, Chicago. If there is a law to allow a railroad company to treat people that way, I would like to know, as I have several trips to make to Chicago with my child before she is cured. This train, to my knowledge, has stopped and taken people on and let them off. If there are people to leave here, they will stop—that is, enough, three or four. They leave us out of our Chicago mail from 5 A. M. till 11:50 A. M. by them not stopping.

Yours,

J. P. MARRON.

The commissioners sent a copy of the foregoing communication to Mr. A. J. Earling, general manager Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, on January 24th, with the statement that if the complainant's contention was correct, they thought such orders should be at once issued as would prevent a repetition of such an occurrence, and that under all circumstances humane and courteous treatment should be accorded all passengers.

Answering this, Mr. Earling, on February 8, 1898, said:

"The report of the conductor of train No. 1 in reference to the complaint of Mr. J. P. Marron, of Jackson Junction, Iowa, referred to in your communication of January 24th, states that when he took up the transportation of this passenger he notified him that he should change cars at Calmar, and there take a train which leaves that station twenty-five minutes behind the passenger train in question, and which stops at Jackson Junction, arriving there fifty-one minutes behind passenger train No. 1. The conductor further states that upon arriving at Calmar he found Mr. Marron still on the train, and that upon arrival at Fort Atkinson, the first station east of Jackson Junction, he helped Mr. Marron off and showed him into the waiting room, in which there was a fire, and which was comfortable in every way. The conductor claims that Mr. Marron said nothing to him about having a sick child, otherwise he certainly would have stopped the train for him at Jackson Junction.

"Train No. 1 is, as you know, a through train, and its time is such that it is impossible for it to make all of the stops. There are many stations along the Iowa & Dakota division, with a much larger population than Jackson Junction, where this train does not stop.

"Except for the sick child, of which the conductor had no knowledge, it would have been no hardship for Mr. Marron to have changed cars at Calmar, and taken the local train which follows the passenger within twenty-five minutes; but, as before stated, if the conductor had known of the condition of Mr. Marron's child, the train certainly would have been stopped for him at Jackson Junction."

As the statements seemed so contradictory the board suggested that statements be made under oath. Mr. Marron filed affidavit showing substantially the same facts stated in his original complaint.

The commissioners in sending this affidavit to the railway company on April 6, 1898, stated to Mr. W. G. Collins, who had succeeded Mr. Earling as general manager, that the commission regarded this matter as one that was important, not only to the traveling public, but to the railway company as well, and they requested that a thorough investigation be made of the case in order to ascertain as nearly as possible what actually transpired between the conductor and the passenger upon this occasion; that if Mr. Marron's statement was true, the commissioners believed that he would agree with them that while possibly the conductor may have followed the instructions and rules of the company in matters of this kind, yet it was an unfortunate and unreasonable requirement in compelling the passenger, under the circumstances existing as claimed by him, to leave the train before arriving at his destination as fixed and determined by the ticket which he then had and was used upon that train; that reasonable rules may, by an unreasonable and arbitrary enforcement thereof, become unreasonable and unnecessarily burdensome to those against whom they are enforced.

On April 16, 1898, Mr. W. G. Collins wrote the board, setting forth that company's position in such matters, and stating that the instructions to conductors covering cases of this kind were, that when they found passengers on the train destined to stations at which the train did not stop, to notify them at what station they are to leave train in order to get a train which made the stop at the station to which they are destined; that in the case of passengers who are ill, or who have young children, or of old people, to whom it would be a hardship to leave the train and wait for another, the general instructions are to stop train at destination and let them off.

Mr. Collins enclosed affidavit of Conductor George H. Klein as follows:

MASON CITY, Iowa, April 9, 1898.

Statement of Conductor George H. Klein, relative to complaint of J. P. Marron, account being ejected from train No. 1, at Fort Atkinson, during the month of January, 1898.

I notified this party, when leaving North McGregor, to change cars at Calmar, as the train would not stop at Jackson Junction, and explained to him that a train would leave Calmar within a few minutes after we arrived there which would stop at Jackson Junction. Upon leaving Calmar the gentleman was still on the train. I said nothing more to him, and when we reached Fort Atkinson I helped him off the train and into the depot. He said nothing about having a sick child until after he got into the depot.

He left the train at Fort Atkinson voluntarily, and there was nothing more said to him after leaving North McGregor.

The only witness I know of to this transaction was Mr. David Green, of Springfield, Mo., who was on the train and heard the conversation between myself and Mr. Marron. I will write Mr. Green and request an affidavit as to his knowledge of the facts.

(Signed)

G. H. KLEIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a notary public, on this date.

(Signed)

C. E. MCNIDER.

Notary Public.

[SEAL.]

The commissioners believing from the statements of the officials of the railway company that no such treatment of passengers as shown in this complaint would be sanctioned by the company; that in the present case the hardship of Mr. Marron resulted more from misunderstanding between the conductor and complainant than any intention on the part of the conductor to wilfully injure him; and that in the future such unfortunate cases would not occur, the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.



No. 2019—1899.

JESSE A. GARRETT, ORILLIA,

v.

*Station facilities.*CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY  
COMPANY.

Complaint filed July 6, 1898.

This complaint stated in substance that the citizens of Orillia and vicinity paid several hundred dollars for which the Chicago Great Western Railway company agreed to "establish and maintain a depot and station;" that the railway company had an agent there nights only and the depot was closed in the daytime; that while there was nothing in the contract indicating whether the station should be a day station or a night station, yet it would seem that a depot opened only at night could hardly be construed as furnishing adequate facilities, etc.

The case was brought to the attention of Mr. S. C. Stickney, general manager Chicago Great Western Railway company, who was asked to advise the board of the results of his investigations.

On August 22, 1898, Mr. Stickney said:

"The business transacted at this station during the past year has amounted to little or nothing. By substituting a night operator for the agent, we are able to dispense with the night operator at an adjacent station. Considering the very small earnings derived from Orillia, we feel justified in having made the change. I have been unable to find any agreement with the citizens of Orillia, by which the company is 'bound to establish and maintain a depot.' If there is such an agreement, I would be glad to have Mr. Garrett send it to me."

The complainant was not satisfied with Mr. Stickney's explanation of the matter, insisting that as the citizens had given \$500 for the depot, and had a contract which was kept at the depot, in the hands of their agent, that station should be maintained, the company should in good faith provide suitable facilities. They also said the contract could not be found after the money was paid, but that by consulting the records in the county recorder's office, several of the receipts could be found which showed that the company is bound "to establish and maintain a depot." That a copy of the receipt could also be found on pages 238 and 239 of report of railroad commissioners for 1896; case No. 5—1894.

Mr. Stickney was informed of the contention of the petitioners, and the board was later advised that an effort would be made to adjust the matter.

Mr. Garrett wrote the board on February 11, 1899, that no change had been made in the operation of that station. Mr. J. Berlingett, division superintendent, called at the commissioners' office and stated that the case would soon be adjusted.

On June 29, 1899, Mr. Garrett withdrew his complaint, saying that satisfactory agreement had been reached between the railway company and the citizens.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2020—1899.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUENA VISTA  
COUNTY, BY F. F. FAVILLE, COUNTY  
ATTORNEY, STORM LAKE,

v.

*Highway crossing at grade.*CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY  
COMPANY.

Complaint filed July 17, 1898.

On July 17, 1898, Mr. F. F. Faville, county attorney of Buena Vista county, filed with the board a statement of the case, which is printed in full:

"In behalf of the board of supervisors of Buena Vista county, I desire to call the attention of the board of railroad commissioners to the following complaint:

"On the 6th day of September, 1897, the board of supervisors of Buena Vista county duly established a road crossing the track of the Chicago & North-Western railway about eighty rods north of the southeast corner of section 14, township 93, north range 36, in Lee township, Buena Vista county, Iowa. Due and legal notice of the establishment of said road was served on the Chicago & North-Western railroad by service on its agent at Marathon, Iowa, on the 20th of May, 1897. No claim for damages was filed by said railroad, and no appeal has, of course, been taken from the establishment of the same. Notice has been served on the railroad company, by the road supervisor of the district in which the highway is located, to remove the obstruction of the fences and open the road, and he had also written the superintendent, W. D. Hodge, of Eagle Grove, Iowa, objecting to the replacing of the wire fences at the point where the highway crossed the road. Under date of July 11th, Mr. Hodge replies: 'I have two or three times defined this company's position in relation to the highway. This company does not object to the opening of the highway, provided the public authorities will assume the expense. The roadmaster replaced the wires in accordance with my instructions, and we shall undertake to maintain them there so long as the authorities do not undertake to assume the expense of opening the highway.'

"Mr. Hodge has also written me substantially to the same effect. The highway crosses the railroad at a point where the railroad company have constructed ditches on either side of the track, so that it will require some grading and probably the construction of two small bridges or culverts to make the proper crossing. As I understand it, the contention of the company is that the county must bear the expense of putting in a crossing, including the embankment and culverts on the right of way, if they are needed, while it is my contention that the railroad should bear it. This road as established is some four miles in length, and is open all of the distance except just this point where it crosses the railroad, and great inconvenience and hardship are occasioned the public by reason of the obstruction of the fences and lack of a crossing. I believe that your board has the jurisdiction, and I am confident will be willing to give this matter their immediate attention and grant the relief demanded, as the matter at present is very urgent."

The complaint was transmitted to the railway company and date, August 18, 1898, was set for inspection of the premises and hearing of parties. Owing to other business intervening, however, the date for hearing and inspection was canceled.



After further correspondence was had between the commissioners and the parties to the case, Mr. J. M. Whitman, general manager Chicago & North-Western Railway company, wrote the board on December 5, 1898, as follows:

You have recently written me further in regard to a communication addressed to the board by County Attorney F. F. Faville, of Storm Lake, Iowa, in regard to a certain highway crossing in Lee township, Buena Vista county, Iowa.

The same question has been taken up a number of times, and the position of the company thereon has been frequently stated. This highway was laid out after the construction of the North-Western company's railroad, and no right as yet, as I understand it, has been acquired by the public authorities to construct a highway across the North-Western company's right of way in the form which the laws of the state of Iowa require. We do not, however, take any exception to this, but are willing that the highway should be extended across the company's right of way, but we do not understand that the cost of grading and putting the highway in condition for travel devolves on the North-Western company, but that it is a cost which the proper public authorities should assume. At any time that the authorities go ahead with this work we are willing that they should do so, and the company expects, of course, to plank the crossing between and immediately on each side of its rails, and also to put in necessary cattle guards and wing fences. Yours truly,

J. M. WHITMAN,  
General Manager.

It seeming that no adjustment could be reached by correspondence the board again fixed a date for inspection and hearing, notifying all parties, and on February 8, 1899, the commissioners visited the locality of the crossing near Marathon, and heard the evidence submitted by the parties. The arguments of counsel were to be made orally to the board at Des Moines at a later date to be agreed upon by the county attorney and Mr. Filkins, attorney for the railway company. Mr. H. F. Schultz, who had succeeded Mr. Faville as county attorney, advised the board that June 22, 1899, had been agreed upon. He was notified that this date was acceptable to the board.

On date named Mr. Schultz appeared for the county and Hon. N. M. Hubbard for the railway company.

Some conference was had by the attorneys and case was continued pending negotiations for amicable adjustment of differences.

The board was later informed that a satisfactory agreement had been entered into between the railway company and the county authorities whereby the crossing would be put in on terms mutually acceptable.

The case is therefore closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 7, 1899.

No. 2021—1899.

J. B. CRUZE, VINCENNES,

v.

CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed September 17, 1898.

This complaint was as follows:

"My outlet to the public highway is across the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railway and their right of way, or 42 feet from the center of the railroad track, is a small bridge about 8 or 10 feet wide. This bridge was washed under at the end next to the railroad and has lowered below the surface of the ground.

I have asked their foreman, Wm. Grant, to fix it and he has refused because it was beyond their fence. Their fence is set in from about 35 to 37 feet from the center of the railroad. I also wrote Mr. W. F. Lee, the roadmaster of this division of the Rock Island, making a statement of facts, and he has treated my request with silent contempt. One reason, I think, why the railroad does not set out their fence full 50 feet on this part of my place is that it would fence out part of the public highway, or in other words the public highway would only be about 20 feet wide. If it is the duty of the railroad to keep this bridge in repair I wish your body would request them to do so at once. The crossing is somewhat dangerous."

The matter was brought to the attention of Mr. W. H. Truesdale, general manager of the railway company, and after some further correspondence had been had Mr. Cruze wrote the board on March 24, 1899, saying that the railway company had put in bridge and that he was satisfied.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2022—1899.

WILLIAM SOUTHAL & SONS, IRWIN AND  
PIERSON,

v.

CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY  
COMPANY.

Scarcity of cars.

Complaint filed October 1, 1898.

The complainants in this case telegraphed the board as follows: "Do you best to get us some cars." The complaint was made known to the company by telegram, and on same day General Manager J. M. Whitman said: "Have instructed our people to give prompt relief to Southall & Sons." Later, October 3, 1898, Mr. Whitman wrote the board as follows:

"I have your telegram stating that Southall & Sons, of Irwin, Iowa, have wired the board complaining of failure to receive cars. I replied to that message, stating that I had instructed our people to relieve the immediate wants of Southall & Sons, and you may rest assured this will be done. The exceedingly liberal crops in the states through which the North-Western lines run have been somewhat backward this year in moving, and the indications now point to a movement that will be concentrated heavily within the next month or six weeks. The Chicago & North-Western Railway company is liberally provided with freight equipment, and every arrangement possible has been made in anticipation of the heavy movement to which I have referred to expedite the handling of equipment, its loading and unloading, and the board may rest assured that the officers of the North-Western company are fully awake and alive to the situation. The Chicago & North-Western Railway company is just as anxious to handle every pound of freight as any shipper is anxious to ship it. Notwithstanding the large freight equipment of the company and the efforts of its transportation officers, I believe there will be more or less complaint reach the commission during the next month or six weeks of failures on the part of some shippers to receive cars as fast as they want them, or in quite as large a quantity as wanted. It will be the aim of the company's transportation officials

Farm crossing. Renewal of bridge  
in private crossing.



to divide the available supply of cars fairly and impartially, and to make extra efforts to relieve points especially needing prompt assistance.

"A more extended movement of fall crops would undoubtedly render such a letter as this unnecessary, as the company would be able to handle the traffic without any cause for complaint. My purpose in writing you on this subject is that you may understand fully the situation."

At other times complaints of the same nature were received from these parties and considerable correspondence was had with the railway company and the complainants. On December 30, 1898, Mr. Whitman advised the board that, "We are still quite short of freight equipment, due very largely, and in fact almost entirely, to the blockade on lines running east from Chicago to the Atlantic seaboard. The eastern lines are making progress daily in clearing up this blockade, and I think that we will be in a position very soon after the first of the year to supply all needs. We shall also, after the first of the year, commence to receive 2,000 new box cars, which will be a further help. In the meantime, the immediate wants of the parties mentioned in this letter will be taken care of."

On January 14, 1899, Messrs. Southall & Sons again complained of the scarcity of cars, and the attention of the company was called to the matter. Answer was received that supply of cars was getting better and parties at Pierson would be taken care of. The complainants were immediately so advised, and as nothing further has been heard in the case, it is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2022—1899.

PATRICK LYONS, NAVAN,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.

*Under grade farm crossing.*

Complaint filed October 8, 1898.

Mr. Lyons, who lives four miles east of Lawler, in section 31, township 96, range 10 west, stated that the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company runs through his farm and he desired a passage way for his cattle. He further said that there was a culvert in the center of the field sixteen feet long and four feet high, which could be made passable; that he had no other crossing except the wagon road, and his cattle were in danger of being killed in driving them the other way.

The case was submitted to Mr. W. G. Collins, general manager Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, who on October 18, 1899, said that their records showed the bridge referred to was not high enough to enable cattle to pass under it; when same should require renewal, it was the intention of the company to renew it with pipe or culvert sufficient to carry away the water, and fill the balance of the present structure. Mr. Lyons was advised of this answer of the company, and on October 26th Messrs. Springer & Clary, attorneys at law, wrote the board, insisting that if the railroad company would not furnish and make passage way, Mr. Lyons should at least have the ordinary crossing.

Copy of letter referred to was forwarded Mr. Collins, and November 15th Mr. Lyons wrote the board stating that the railroad company had offered to put in an open crossing for him, but he told them he would not accept it, as an open cross-

ing without cattle guards would be of no use to him in driving cattle across the track.

On November 21, 1898, General Manager Collins wrote the board, stating that "Mr. Lyons' buildings are located close to the north and south highway, and that up to the present he has used this highway to reach his land on either side of the track, and that the highway is located but a few rods east of where a private crossing would naturally be located.

"Our superintendent has advised Mr. Lyons that he would furnish him a private crossing, but he declines to accept it and insists upon an under cattle pass at bridge R-194, which we must decline to furnish. The bridge is not high enough to enable cattle to pass under, and we can see no reason for raising it, nor for maintaining it as a waterway, as a pipe or culvert would carry away the water at that place."

Some further correspondence was had between the board and the railway company and the complainants, and on September 9th the board wrote Messrs. Springer & Clary as follows:

"The subject of under grade farm crossings is one that has been before the board some time, and the commissioners are in doubt whether, under the law and the decisions of the supreme court interpreting the same, they would have the right to order an under grade crossing, at least where the conditions were such that the ordinary grade farm crossing could be readily constructed.

"The commissioners, however, are of the opinion that public safety would seem to demand that wherever it is practicable to do so, such crossings should be made over or under grade, but the supreme court has, perhaps unintentionally, indicated that grade crossing should be preferred.

"You will please submit to this board your opinion concerning the authority of this board under the law and decisions of the supreme court to order the construction of under or over grade crossings.

"The board will appreciate an early answer."

On September 21, 1899, Messrs. Springer & Clary wrote the board in answer that it might be doubtful whether or not Mr. Lyons, under the decision of the supreme court of Iowa, would be entitled to an under crossing where the conditions are such that an ordinary crossing could be constructed. They insisted that the under passage way, by right, should be constructed for Mr. Lyons, but that if the railway company would not do that then Mr. Lyons was certainly entitled to an ordinary farm crossing with cattle guards.

On October 9th, the board wrote Mr. Collins enclosing copy of letter written by Mr. Lyons' attorneys and his attention was called to section 2022 of the code of 1897, which reads as follows:

"When any person owns land on both sides of any railroad, the corporation owning the same shall, when requested so to do, make and keep in good repair one cattle guard, and one causeway or other adequate means of crossing the same at such a reasonable place as may be designated by the owner."

His attention was further called to the decision of the Iowa supreme court in case of State v. Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company, 68 N. W. Reporter, page 819, wherein it was held that the words "one cattle guard" did not mean the single structure and one side of the causeway, but such guard "as would prevent stock from getting on the track, on either side of the causeway." Mr. Collins, on October 10th, notified the board that the company was



ready to build a grade crossing for Mr. Lyons. Messrs. Springer & Clary were then notified and it is assumed that this disposition of the matter is reasonably satisfactory to the complainants.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2024—1899.

BRUNING BROS., BREDA,

V.

CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY  
COMPANY.

Scarcity of cars.

Complaint filed October 14, 1898.

The complainants in this case stated that they were being greatly damaged by the failure to receive cars for shipment of grain. The attention of the company was called to the matter and the wants of the shippers were finally relieved.

Again, on January 13, 1899, the complainants said that they must have ten cars within two days or suffer great loss. Mr. J. M. Whitman, general manager, was notified by telegram of this complaint and at the same time the board sent the following letter to the complainants:

January 14, 1899.

"Your letter of the 13th inst. received this morning. The company has been asked to help you out, if possible, and it is hoped you will be furnished enough cars to relieve the situation.

"In this connection, allow me to say that this board has made considerable investigation into the matter of scarcity of cars in the western territory, and find the situation to be the same quite generally. It is claimed that the western lines are in no way to blame for this condition, as the blockade in cars of grain east of Chicago has been so severe as to tie up the equipment that might be used for this western business. It is understood, however, that the blockade is being rapidly cleared, and it is hoped that within a short time the supply of cars will be normal. Mr. Whitman, general manager of the Chicago & North-Western Railway company, said in a recent letter to this office, that his company would begin soon to receive 2,000 new box cars, ordered for delivery this year, and this, together with the raising of the blockade in the east, should, before a great while, remedy the matter of which you complain.

"The board will, at all times, be glad to render you any assistance possible, under the circumstances."

The company was again telegraphed on January 24th upon receipt of further complaint from Bruning Bros.; again on January 31, 1899. On the latter date Mr. W. A. Gardner, assistant general superintendent, telegraphed that "Breda was given four box cars to-day and will be given three or four to-morrow, all we think they can load at one time."

On February 16th they again complained of the scarcity of cars, and the matter was again brought to the attention of the railroad company.

Mr. J. M. Whitman, general manager Chicago & North-Western Railway company, wrote the board on February 18th as follows:

SIR—In reply to your letter of the 17th of February in reference to complaint received from Bruning Bros. of Breda, Iowa:

I assure you that these people are being given as good a supply of cars as it is possible for us to furnish in view of the recent weather conditions, and they are receiving their full and equal share of cars available. During the severe cold weather we were forced practically to suspend 60 per cent of our freight traffic, while the unloading of cars at stations was almost entirely suspended. While the weather conditions have been favorable during the last three or four days, the loaded cars have not as yet been relieved in a sufficient number to enable them to be returned to the country stations for further loading. By Monday morning next we will have a much better supply of cars than we have had during the last few days.

In view of the many complaints made to the board by Bruning Bros. of Breda, does it not seem a little strange that this firm is practically the only shipper out of many thousands in the state of Iowa who seem to have any difficulty in having their wants properly and reasonably met by the North-Western company?

On September 23d Bruning Bros. complained of their inability to get cars, stating, "Our elevator is not in good condition; likely to spread any moment and blockade the track." The matter was taken up with the company as usual, and Mr. S. M. Braden, superintendent, wrote the board September 27th as follows:

We wish to advise that equipment of all descriptions is extremely scarce at the present writing. We have, however, forwarded four cars to Bruning Bros. at Breda to-day. We will keep them as well supplied as possible. It is impossible, of course, to show any impartiality in supplying cars, and we distribute them as evenly as we can."

On October 14th the complainants insisted that their elevator was leaking and "bulging" and they must have cars. Again the matter was called to the attention of the company and Mr. Braden said on October 18th that, "I have to advise that we are doing everything possible to furnish the cars wanted. If you could use your influence with consignees and persuade them to unload cars more promptly, you would be conferring a favor not only on the railway company, but on the consignees and the patrons at large.

"Our only supply at present is such cars as we can unload at stations."

Copy of Mr. Braden's letter was sent to complainants.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2025—1899.

GEORGE HUMMER MERCANTILE COM-  
PANY, IOWA CITY.

V.

BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTH-  
WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Excessive rates (interstate).

Complaint filed November 9, 1898.

In this complaint the George Hummer Mercantile company stated that rate on cartridges from Cincinnati to Clinton was 34 cents per 100 pounds; from Clinton to Iowa City, had the shipment originated in Clinton, the rate would be only 17 3/4-100 cents. This case was brought to the attention of Mr. W. P. Brady, general agent of the railway company, who replied on March 27th as follows:

"Mr. T. H. Simmons, our general freight agent, advises me that the rate of 34 cents from Cincinnati to the river, and 33 3/4 cents from the river to Iowa City, are both proportional rates and do not represent local rates either to or from the river, as the local rate from Cincinnati to Clinton is 50 cents per cwt., except on business destined beyond the Mississippi river proportional rates apply; likewise the 33 3/4 cents from Clinton to Iowa City is merely the proportional rate on business originating in eastern territory.



"It would seem that this explanation ought to be satisfactory to the mercantile company."

Copy of Mr. Brady's letter was sent the complainants and they were advised that the commission had no jurisdiction over interstate shipments such as the one referred to in their letter, and had taken the case up in order that they might know why the charge made by them had been made, and if overcharge had been made that the same might be corrected.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2026—1899.

T. M. FOSTER, NORTH ENGLISH,

v.

BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTH-  
ERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

} Overcharge.

Complaint filed November 14, 1898.

Mr. T. M. Foster, on November 12th, sent an expense bill to the board showing charges on one box of drugs from Cedar Rapids to North English, 30 pounds weight, of \$1.50—25 cents being the charge made by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, and \$1.25 being the back charges made by the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company. The complainant claimed the back charges to be excessive as the distance over the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern is less than the distance over the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railway. The matter was brought to the attention of Mr. W. P. Brady, general agent of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company, who explained the charges made in the following letter dated December 21st:

"The following are the items of the back charges on this shipment:

Freight charges, North English to Cedar Rapids.....	\$ .25
Freight charges Cedar Rapids to Iowa City.....	.25
Freight charges Iowa City to Cedar Rapids.....	.25
Freight charges Cedar Rapids to North English.....	.25
Boxing and packing at Iowa City.....	.50

Total.....\$1.50

"It would seem from the itemized statement above, that this box of drugs made a trip from Cedar Rapids to Iowa City and back, and while at the latter place there accrued a boxing and packing charge of 50 cents. When the consignee, Mr. Foster, receives the information in detail as above, he should be able to decide as to the necessity for these charges, as we are at a loss to know the necessity that prompted them. I desire to have the board note the fact that had the advanced charges not accrued, the rate from Iowa City to Cedar Rapids would have been the same on this shipment as from Cedar Rapids to North English."

Under the latter date, Mr. Foster was advised of the explanation made by the railroad company, and as nothing further has been heard from him, the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2027—1899.

W. A. GRAY, ALBIA,

v.

IOWA CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

} Private crossing at grade.

Complaint filed November 16, 1898.

The board received the following letter from Mr. W. A. Nichols, attorney at law:

ALBIA, Iowa, November 15, 1898.

Railroad Commissioners, Des Moines, Iowa:

GENTLEMEN—W. A. Gray and family have occupied for many years and now do occupy a homestead of about fifteen acres, lying within the corporate limits of this city, which is not platted, or subdivided by streets and alleys, with a dwelling house, barn and appurtenant buildings on the north end, and an artificial reservoir, ice house, and steam laundry on the south end, being engaged in the ice trade and laundry business, and being dependent upon the avails thereof, together with the use of said land for agricultural and grazing purposes for their living and family expenses. The Iowa Central Railway company has recently caused a strip 100 feet in width to be assessed by a sheriff's jury as a right of way, made a grade and laid a railroad track thereon, across said land, between the house and said buildings on the north, and the reservoir, ice house and laundry on the south, and refuse to make or furnish any crossing over said railroad track upon said land, although requested to do so by the owner. Respectfully.

WM. A. NICHOLS,  
Attorney for Grays.

The board advised Mr. Nichols that if the crossing referred to was public in its nature, the commissioners could not take action until the street had not only been duly established by the town of Albia, but the land or property over which the same may have been established is condemned, as required by law.

If his letter referred to a private crossing, then, the commissioners said, it would seem to be the duty of the railway company, where the land owner owns land on both sides of the railway track, to provide a suitable private crossing.

The case was taken up with the Iowa Central Railway company, and on December 19, 1898, Mr. L. M. Martin, general manager, answered as follows:

"Upon investigating this matter I find that Mr. Gray has now pending in the Monroe county district court, a suit to compel the Albia & Centerville railway to maintain an open private crossing between his place and the property on the east side of the track, belonging to some other member of the Gray family, claiming that when he gave the right of way to the Albia & Centerville railway that a contract was made providing that he should have an open private crossing at the point designated, protected by wing fences and cattle guards. Gray further states that the contract is a part of and appears in the right of way for the above mentioned land.

"We have been unable to find any record, either in the files of the railway company or the office of the recorder of Monroe county, to substantiate Mr. Gray's claim, and to the best of my knowledge there has never been an open crossing maintained at that point.

"Parallel with the right of way of the Albia & Centerville railway, and immediately adjoining the same, is the right of way formerly owned by the Iowa Central Railroad company, afterwards acquired by the Albia & Moravia Railway company (Chicago, Burlington & Quincy) by condemnation, upon which right of way they constructed their line toward Moulton, Iowa, paying W. A. Gray \$300 for said right of way.



"The Iowa Central Railway company has recently acquired this last mentioned right of way by the purchase of a quit claim from the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy; also by condemnation of sheriff's jury.

"There never was any contract between W. A. Gray and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroad or the Albia & Moravia Railway company, and when we acquired this right of way the title in the two separate tracts of land did not lie in the name of W. A. Gray, and if he owns the land upon the east side of the railway tracks and the rights of way, he has acquired same since the Iowa Central Railway company has constructed its line to Hickory Coal mine, and said land is in no manner a part or parcel of the homestead of W. A. Gray.

"Further, Mr. Gray can reach the public highway at a shorter distance, from another point on his land, without crossing the railway tracks, than by the route he now designates and desires to be maintained in his behalf. The Iowa Central Railway company, operating and in a way protecting against the suit of Mr. Gray v. the Albia & Centerville Railway company, could not consistently give Mr. Gray a crossing over its own track and right of way, having denied his right to one over the Albia & Centerville Railway, immediately adjoining."

Copy of the answer of the railway company was sent Mr. Nichols, who on February 25, 1899, wrote the board stating that Mr. Martin was in error as to the real facts in the case, but that there was a suit pending to compel an open crossing over the Albia & Centerville track, which lies south and adjacent to that of the Iowa Central, the Albia & Centerville railway being now operated by the Iowa Central. Mr. Nichols stated further that the land on both sides of these tracks belongs to the same person, constituting the Gray homestead; that he did not think there was any other reasonable way of reaching the land on the south side of the track except at the crossing which the Iowa Central was attempting to close; that the case presented the right of a land owner having land on both sides of a railroad to have a crossing from one tract to the other; that the right was statutory; that the case to determine the right of crossing over the track of the Albia & Centerville Railway company would likely be determined in the district court during term beginning March 13th.

Upon receipt of Mr. Nichols' letter, the commissioners wrote him that inasmuch as there was a suit pending in the district court to determine the right of Mr. Gray to a crossing over the track of the Albia & Centerville, which ran parallel to that of the Iowa Central, and the effectiveness of any action taken by the board in the premises must be largely controlled by the decision of the court in said case, the complaint filed with the commission against the Iowa Central would be held, awaiting the decision of the court in the case against the Albia & Centerville, of which Mr. Nichols was asked to advise the board as soon as possible.

Not hearing from Mr. Nichols, the commissioners asked again, on September 12th, that he advise them of the result of the suit in the district court. No answer has been received, and the case will be considered closed unless the parties thereto request the reopening of the same.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 7, 1899.

No 2028—1899.

CITY OF DAVENPORT,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL  
RAILWAY COMPANY.

} Viaduct.

Petition filed November 18, 1898.

The mayor and city clerk of the city of Davenport filed with the board the resolutions of the city council of that city, asking the commissioners to make an examination of Eastern avenue or Orphans' Home road and determine whether or not a viaduct is necessary for the public safety and convenience where the line of respondent railway company crosses said avenue or road, and alleging that public convenience and safety did demand such viaduct.

The board notified the railway company of said resolutions and fixed Monday, December 12, 1898, for inspection and hearing at Davenport. On December 10th, however, the city clerk, Mr. A. J. Smith, wired the commissioners saying that negotiations were pending for a settlement of the matter, and asking that hearing be postponed. This was done, and, not hearing anything further, the board wrote Mr. Smith, on February 8, 1899, inquiring what had been done. On February 11th he replied that he was instructed by the council to say that the viaduct matter was not yet settled, but probably would be within sixty days.

Later, the board were advised that a substantial viaduct was being erected at the point in question, and the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.

No. 2029—1899.

N. B. NEMMERS, LAMOTTE,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.

} Side track to elevator.

Complaint filed Nov. 23, 1898.

Mr. Nemmers brought this case to the attention of the board in the following letter:

LAMOTTE, Iowa, November 19, 1898.

To the Iowa State Railroad Commissioners, Des Moines, Iowa:

GENTLEMEN—You will please excuse me for addressing your honorable body. About two years ago, Mr. John Diedrich, a grain and lumber dealer, from Lever, built a new warehouse about 250 feet from the main track, under the promise from Superintendent Stapleton, of Dubuque (Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul), that the company would build him a switch to the said warehouse, which they now refuse to do, but in place of that they requested him to move his warehouse about the distance of a block west and the company would continue the old switch further west. The warehouse is a large one and built on heavy piles, and is a new building, and is very hard to remove. Mr. Diedrich says he can not move it and would rather give up the business, which would be a great loss to this community and our business people. Mr. Diedrich has now for about two years transferred his grain from the warehouse into the cars by team, which everybody knows is very detrimental, especially in wet or cold weather. He ships about fifty cars per annum of grain to Chicago, and besides he handles lumber by the car load all the year around. We have another warehouse here which is located very



convenient, as it should be, and is operated by J. F. Cahill. It appears that the company would be satisfied with one warehouse, but the farming community and town demand two; this is a great shipping point and the people want more than one buyer. A switch of about 250 feet would probably be sufficient. The ground is level, hence you see the expense would be light. I now ask your honorable body to look into the matter, and in case you want a petition or any other information, we will be pleased to furnish it. Please let me hear from you on the subject.

The commission advised the railway company of the filing of the complaint, and suggested that, if the substance of Mr. Nemmers' letter was substantially correct, it would seem as though the company ought not to have permitted the construction of a warehouse at this point, unless it was the intention of the company to build a side track or switch to the same.

After some further correspondence had been had, Mr. Collins informed the commissioners that, as soon as weather conditions would permit in the spring, the company would build a spur track to serve Mr. John Diedrich's warehouse.

Mr. Nemmers was advised of Mr. Collins' statement, and on January 20, 1899, he thanked them for the satisfactory adjustment of the matter.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2030—1899.

GEORGE L. CARMAN, SUPERINTENDENT }  
WESTERN RAILWAY WEIGHING AS- } *Shrinker used on scales to defraud.*  
SOCIATION AND INSPECTION BUREAU.

During December, 1898, the board received notice from Mr. Carman that a certain device was being used on scales to defraud farmers and persons selling grain and live stock to warehouse men.

The board promptly gave the matter as much publicity as possible, and wrote to Mr. Carman calling attention to the same.

On May 31st Mr. Carman again wrote the board saying that the device mentioned in his letter of December last was being sold to parties in Iowa, and that they had knowledge of one or two places in Iowa where parties had purchased them.

The board thanked Mr. Carman for calling their attention to this matter, and, as before, it was given to the public press.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2031—1899.

W. J. BEST, VILLISCA,

V.

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAIL- }  
WAY COMPANY.

*Excess rate (interstate).*

Complaint filed December 9, 1898.

The complainant in this case stated that he was being discriminated against in the matter of rates from St. Louis to Omaha, and that he could no longer do business under such circumstances. While the board recognized the matter as interstate and not within its jurisdiction, yet the case was laid before the company for such attention as it would be pleased to give it. Mr. J. M. Bechtel, D.

F. A., Burlington, wrote to the board stating that Mr. Best had been misinformed, and that he would have Mr. Davenport of the company call on Mr. Best and go over the ground with him. This was communicated to Mr. Best with the statement that the board could afford him no further aid; that the matter was interstate; regretted their inability to assist him further; that the proper tribunal to bring the case before was the interstate commerce commissioners at Washington, D. C.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2032—1899.

J. C. RIECHERS, POINT LOOKOUT, UTAH,

V.

CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY }  
COMPANY.

*Damage by fire from locomotive.*

Complaint filed December 30, 1898.

Mr. J. C. Riechers, Point Lookout, Utah, wrote the board on December 26th, stating that he had had about three acres of shocked barley in field in O'Brien county, Iowa, destroyed by sparks from a Chicago & North-Western locomotive, for which the railway company had failed to settle; that he had reported the matter in the regular way to the railway company, giving the average yield of that field as thirty-five bushels per acre, for which he received 30 cents a bushel, but that he had not received any satisfaction; that the loss occurred on July 19, 1898, and about September 7th he left for Utah; that before going he had sent the claim to the division superintendent at Eagle Grove, who had informed him that he would notify the claim department and have it settled as soon as possible.

The matter was brought to the attention of Mr. J. M. Whitman, general manager, who advised the board on January 20th that he had instructed the claim department to take the case up with Mr. Riechers, and believed there would be no difficulty in adjusting it.

Mr. Riechers was immediately advised of the action, and as nothing has since been heard from him, it may be safely assumed that the claim has been settled, and the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 11, 1899.

No. 2033—1899.

M. SCHNEFF, EAST ELKPORT,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAIL- }  
WAY COMPANY.

*Delay in handling freight.*

Complaint filed January 16, 1899.

The complainant in this matter said that the shippers were having difficulty at that point in having cars, after being loaded, hauled promptly by the company. The case was brought to the attention of the railway company, and on January 24th, having other business along this branch of the railroad company, the com-



missioners also took up this complaint, and after discussing the matter it was amicably adjusted, and the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 11, 1899.

No. 2034—1899.

E. J. EDMONDS, MARCUS,

v.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.

*Elevator site at Ashton.*

Complaint filed January 17, 1899.

Mr. Edmonds wrote the board stating that he wanted a location for elevator site at Ashton; that the company refused to grant him the same; that in 1892 he had the same matter up with the board of railroad commissioners and finally secured site, but that at that time he had purchased other houses and did not accept the site; he now wishes the site; that the conditions are the same at Ashton as they were in 1892.

The matter was brought to the attention of the railway company, and on January 24th Mr. W. A. Scott, general manager, advised the board that all available property for elevator sites at Ashton had been under lease for some time and most of it occupied; that Mr. P. H. Peavey made application for site before Mr. Edmonds filed the application he referred to, and is to construct an elevator there of 40,000 bushels capacity, and as all other ground is occupied by coal sheds and other buildings which are in use, he could see no reasonable grounds for cancelling leases held in good faith by other parties, to locate another elevator which would not be at all needed after Mr. Peavey's is constructed; that if Mr. Edmonds had taken the location they granted him, all would have been satisfactory, but he concluded not to accept it after they made the tender, and as Mr. Peavey then made his application and is acting upon it in good faith the company could not discover what cause Mr. Edmonds had for complaint, for surely it would not be to his interest any more than the company's to have any more elevators there than there would be when Mr. Peavey's was finished.

Mr. Edmonds, in a later letter, insisted that he wanted the site whether Mr. Peavey went in there or not. The commissioners visited Ashton on February 28th, heard statements of parties for both the railway company and Mr. Edmonds, inspected the premises and noted the elevators already constructed. On March 27, 1899, the board wrote Mr. Edmonds that the question of elevator sites had been before the board on many different occasions, and that the authority of the board with reference thereto was to some extent in doubt. The board further said:

"A decision rendered by the supreme court of the United States, in what is known as the Nebraska case, seems to hold that the authority of the state board of railroad commissioners upon questions of this kind is limited, and in that case they held that the board of railroad commissioners of Nebraska could not make a valid order appropriating the property of a railway company for uses of this kind. However, this board has been inclined to hold that it is the duty of a railway company to grant the right for elevator and warehouse purposes upon its right of way sufficient and adequate to transact, in the ordinary way, grain and

other business at the different stations along its line in this state. This is about as far as the board has believed it had the authority to go.

"The question to whom this right or privilege shall be granted is lodged with the railway company. Of course such company must exercise this right, as well as all others, in a reasonable and proper manner, but it is the opinion of the board that it has no more authority to designate the person to whom this privilege shall be granted than it would have to designate the person who should be employed by the railway company.

"If, in your judgment and opinion, there is not sufficient ground granted or extended to elevator or warehouse owners or operators at this point to properly handle and ship the grain received there, the board will be glad to render you any assistance in procuring such additional grounds as may be necessary to that end, but it would not be inclined to interfere with the railway company with reference to whom such additional grounds or privilege should be extended.

"The board would be pleased to render you any aid or assistance that it might be able to in the premises."

On September 20th Mr. Edmonds wrote the board again stating that no elevator had been erected at Ashton since the ----- and he thought he should be allowed to build an elevator there. In answering Mr. Edmonds, his attention was called to the board's letter heretofore, and he was advised that a petition signed by the farmers bringing produce to Ashton for marketing, or would do so if he was granted a site for elevator at that place, ought to have considerable influence with the railroad company and that if it could be signed by the business men of Ashton it would add to its influence. He was further advised that from the commissioners' examination of the premises and the statements made at the hearing, there seemed to be hardly enough shipments offered at that place to keep the elevators running that were already there, but if it could be shown to the railroad company that it would prove profitable to build the elevator the site would quite likely be granted.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2035—1899.

In matter of train connection at Waterloo between the Illinois Central Railroad company and Chicago Great Western Railway company.

January 18, 1899.

The attention of the commissioners had been at various times called to the arriving time at Waterloo of the train leaving Mona in the early morning on Illinois Central, which was a few minutes after the departure of the Chicago Great Western train south, at 7:42 A. M. The matter was taken up personally with the officials of the Illinois Central Railroad company, who assured the board they were willing to shorten their time so that connection might be made if the Chicago Great Western would make their leaving time a little later. The case was thereupon laid before General Manager S. C. Stickney of the Chicago Great Western Railway company on January 18, 1899.

The Chicago Great Western Railway company advises the commission that they were willing to arrange a new schedule, if satisfactory concessions were made by the Illinois Central, and meantime issued the following notice:



TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE  
CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY,  
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT.

Bulletin No. 282.

DES MOINES, January 23, 1899.

*All Concerned:*

Train No. 5 will hereafter wait at East Waterloo to connect with Illinois Central train No. 32, due at 8 o'clock A. M., when, by so doing, connection can be made, and providing a report is received in advance of the leaving time of No. 5 indicating that there are passengers on the Illinois Central train who desire to make connection with our train.

J. BERLINGETT,  
Superintendent.

At a later time the commissioners were advised that passengers desiring to make the transfer at Waterloo were fully accommodated, and the case is closed.  
Des Moines, Iowa, November 13, 1899.

No. 2036—1899.

KEOKUK & WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY

v.

CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Refusal to switch.*

Complaint filed January 25, 1899

The Keokuk & Western Railway company filed formal complaint with this board dated January 25th, copy of which follows below:

"The Keokuk & Western Railroad company delivered to the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company, on the transfer track at the station named Rock Island Crossing on the line of the Keokuk & Western railroad, 19.76 miles south of Des Moines, Keokuk & Western car 8,113, loaded with lump coal, on the 19th day of January, 1899, consigned to Barney Johnson, Bevington, Iowa, a point on their Winterset branch of railroad about three miles west of Rock Island Crossing.

"The officials of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railway refuse to accept said car of coal and refuse to forward same to destination.

"All charges appertaining to or accruing on said coal to Rock Island Crossing have been paid and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railway has only to forward the car to Bevington and collect their local tariff on same. They base their refusal to remove said car on the grounds that Rock Island Crossing is not a 'regularly authorized junction point.'

"The commissioners will, doubtless, recall the matter of establishing a connecting or transfer track at this point on the application of the Des Moines & Kansas City Railway company in the year 1897, for such business of which this car of coal is a part and under contemplation when connection tracks were ordered built by the commissioners.

"As the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company refuse to join the Keokuk & Western Railroad company in joint rates established by the railroad commissioners, the Keokuk & Western company to handle such business as rep-

resented by this car of coal is obliged to make a way bill to cover such freight with the charges collected to Rock Island Crossing, sending said way bill to Keokuk & Western agent and office, Des Moines, at which point Keokuk & Western agent makes a transfer bill covering consignment and delivers to Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific agent, Des Moines, which should be given to Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific conductor of train, whose duty, when so handed, is to pick up said car of freight at Rock Island Crossing and forward to destination, the agent at destination collecting Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific local charges.

"The proper billing and transfer way bill in the case of car 8,113, coal for Bevington, was followed and delivered to agent of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific, Des Moines, or his representative. I attach copy of transfer way bill, marked 'A,' as a part of this correspondence, also telegraphic correspondence with Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific officials.

"The car of coal at this date is still on transfer at Rock Island Crossing, subject to change from the elements, and the consignee is deprived of his property by the action of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company.

"The Keokuk & Western Railroad company hereby makes a request of the commissioners that the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway company be ordered to forward, without delay, the car of coal in question.

Respectfully,  
A. C. GOODRICH,  
Vice-President and General Manager Keokuk & Western Railroad Company."

The case was immediately taken up with respondent company by wire, and on January 30th the commission requested the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific to switch the cars in question, and, if they so desired, the rights of the parties could be determined at a later time. However, after the switching of the cars, it seemed that no further action on the part of the board was desired and the case was closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 11, 1899.

No. 2037—1899.

G. F. SCHAFNIT, MOSCOW,

v.

CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Refusal to furnish cars for ear corn.*

Complaint filed January 30, 1899.

Mr. Schafnit complained that the agent at Moscow told him he could not furnish cars for shipment of ear corn to Davenport for shelling, but that on date of his letter he saw two cars of ear corn were going to be loaded; that he asked the agent about it, and he told him that the company had granted a permit for it to Counselman & Co. Mr. Schafnit asked whether Mr. Counselman had a better right to ship ear corn than anybody else, and whether the railroad company can favor one man and not grant the same to other shippers.

The complaint was brought to the attention of the railway company, who explained the situation, saying that at the time Mr. Schafnit desired to load cars the elevator at Davenport was clogged with the amount of corn on hand for shelling, the tracks full of loaded cars, and they could receive no more grain until some of that which they had was disposed of, and agents were instructed to



receive no more for them until further notice; that, later, the situation was relieved, the blockade notice withdrawn, and that would explain why Counselman & Co. were allowed to load the cars as stated by Mr. Schafnit; that Mr. Schafnit was advised of these facts by the railway company.

The board wrote Mr. Schafnit, informing him of the answer of the railway company, and he advised the board, on February 1st, that he had received notice of the raising of the blockade, and thanked the commissioners for their prompt action and careful attention in the matter.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2038—1899.

CITIZENS OF STRAHAN AND VICINITY

v.

OMAHA & ST. LOUIS RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Stopping fast train at small stations.*

Petition filed March 4, 1899.

Hon. A. J. Chantry, of Malvern, filed with the board a numerous signed petition of the citizens of Strahan and vicinity, asking that the board use its influence and endeavor to induce the Port Arthur Railroad company to stop its passenger train No. 14 at that station in Mills county, alleging that the public was very much inconvenienced on account of that train not stopping at said station.

The matter was laid before Mr. B. S. Josselyn, general superintendent, who made reply on March 9, 1899, as follows:

"I have yours of the 6th instant, conveying to me the complaint of the Hon. A. J. Chantry, of Malvern, Iowa, inclosing petition of citizens of Strahan and vicinity, concerning the stopping of train No. 14 at that station. I appreciate, to some extent, the disadvantage these people labor under by reason of train No. 14 not stopping at that station, but you will admit that there are always two sides to every question. This train carries the fast mail, Omaha to St. Louis, in competition with the 'Burlington,' and we are forced to cut every stop possible in order to make the time required, so that we can hold this fast mail to our line. If it were not for the revenue we derive from this fast mail, we could not afford to run the train, or if that train were run, the other would be required to come off.

"I will be very glad, therefore, if you will say to Mr. Chantry that the failure to stop this train at Strahan, and several other points on the Omaha & St. Louis, is not due to any feeling of indifference to our patrons, but is necessary in order that we may give the United States government the service they require.

"At any time this condition changes so that we may have more time to give this train, or that our physical condition is in such shape that we can make fast time and also make stops, we shall be very glad to do so."

Copy of the foregoing was furnished Mr. Chantry, on March 13th, for his information and any further statements he might desire to file before the case was closed. No word has been received from the complainants, however, and it being the policy of the board not to interfere with the running of through fast trains, unless a much stronger showing is made than was made in this complaint, the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2039—1899.

W. J. R. BECK, FT. MADISON,

v.

ST. LOUIS, KEOKUK & NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Train service.*

Complaint filed March 4, 1899.

This complaint stated in substance that on February 28th, the complainant with a number of others at Montrose, had desired to take freight train that ordinarily passed that station about 2:30 P. M., advertised to carry passengers to Ft. Madison, and had purchased tickets for same; that agent had informed them that the train would not stop at depot, so when train arrived about 5 P. M., he and others walked down the yards to get aboard; that the conductor refused to allow them to get on, showing his orders to that effect; that the parties desiring to take passage thereupon had to walk back to the depot in the rain and wait for No. 5 until 6:35 P. M.; that each Wednesday the freight ran as a fast stock train and did not carry passengers; that all other days the train was advertised to carry passengers; that there are plenty of trains running on this road which could carry passengers at little expense to the road, and to the great accommodation of the public.

The complaint was duly forwarded to the railway company, and, on March 29, 1899, Mr. Howard Elliott, general manager, wrote the board as follows:

"Your letter of March 6th, transmitting copy of a communication from Mr. W. J. R. Beck, of Fort Madison, Iowa, was duly received; also your letter of March 27th on the same subject.

"The company regrets, and I personally regret, extremely the inconvenience occasioned Mr. Beck by the change in the running time of the way freight between Hannibal and Burlington on Tuesday, February 28th. We also regret that the same instructions that were given to the conductor did not reach the agent at Montrose, so that the latter could have advised Mr. Beck of the situation. If you will examine the official time card referred to by Mr. Beck, you will see in heavy type, on page 24, the following clause: 'The tables herein show the time trains should arrive and depart from the several stations and connect with other trains, but their arrival, departure or connection at time stated is not guaranteed. The time of trains is subject to change without notice.'

"Freight trains are run, of course, primarily, to take care of the commerce of the country, and that commerce cannot be carried on if the freight trains are to be subject to passenger requirements, and if those requirements are to be the governing conditions in handling freight.

"Our company, however, in common with others, aims to supplement its passenger train service by permitting passengers to ride on freight trains, as a matter of accommodation, but, of course, reserving to itself the right to change these trains in any way that may be necessary for the proper accommodation of the commercial business of the country.

"As having some bearing on this, I enclose a copy of a letter from the superintendent on that part of the road. The company could not very well have declined to handle the live stock without embarrassing the owners of the stock, and did what it thought best at that time.



"The responsible officers of the company have not felt satisfied for some time with the passenger train service between Burlington and Keokuk, but have never been able to devise any scheme that would improve it without spending very much more than the corresponding receipts of the travel between those two points."

"We now have under discussion a plan which may produce a train leaving Keokuk about 11 o'clock in the morning, arriving at Burlington about 1, and returning from Burlington at about 6, arriving at Keokuk about 8. A train of this character will remove some of the difficulties complained of by Mr. Beck."

Mr. Elliott endorsed the letter from the superintendent, Mr. W. E. Cunningham, explaining the situation on Tuesday, February 23, and the reasons for the regulations concerning the running of the free freight.

Mr. Beck was advised of Mr. Elliott's answer, copy of the same, as well as of Mr. Cunningham's letter, being sent him, and after some additional correspondence had been had, the complainant wrote the board as follows:

"I and the travelling public have to thank you for a train which to-day (May 15, 1899) made its first trip from Keokuk to Burlington. This was brought about by the interest you took in my complaint of the 3d of March, 1899."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.

No. 2040—1899.

FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,  
VERNE S. ELLIS, SECRETARY, SWEA  
CITY.

v.

BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTH-  
ERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Filed March 9, 1899.

Site for elevator.

This was an inquiry more than a complaint, and was given careful consideration by the board and answered as fully as possible under the circumstances. The answer by the board was in the nature of a declaration of the position taken by the commissioners in cases of this kind, and it is for this reason that the correspondence follows in full:

SWEA CITY, IOWA, March 6, 1899.

DEAR SIRS—I am instructed by the Farmers' Co-operative association to place a matter before you for information.

A year ago this company, duly organized under laws of Iowa, made application to the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern for a site at this place for an elevator, and the same was refused on the grounds that already SWEA City had two elevators and a site had been granted for a third (which, by the way, has since been built), and the company insisted that three was enough for any town on their line. The question is, has the railroad company exclusive authority to say when enough elevators are at a place and refuse a site to an association numbering upwards of sixty shareholders?

If your honorable board will sustain the decision of the railroad, then the association must give up, but, on the other hand, if we can demand and obtain a site for a fair showing, we are ready to raise the money and go ahead. Awaiting your reply, I am

Very truly yours,

VERNE S. ELLIS.

The Board answered, saying:

Replying to your favor of the 6th inst. with reference to your application for an elevator site upon the right of way of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railroad company at SWEA City, you are advised that this question has been before the board upon

many different occasions, and that the authority of the board, with reference thereto, is to some extent in doubt.

A decision rendered by the supreme court of the United States, in what is known as the Nebraska case, seems to hold that the authority of the state board of railroad commissioners upon questions of this kind is limited, and in that case they held that the board of railroad commissioners of Nebraska could not make a valid order appropriating the property of a railway for uses of this kind. However, this board has been inclined to hold that it is the duty of a railway company to grant the right for elevator and warehouse purposes upon its right of way, sufficient and adequate to transact. In the ordinary way, grain and other business at the different stations along its line in this state. This is about as far as the board has believed it has the authority to go.

The question to whom this right or privilege shall be granted is lodged in the railroad company. Of course such company must exercise this right, as well as all others, in a reasonable and proper manner, but it is the opinion of the board that it has no more authority to designate the person to whom this privilege shall be granted than it would have to designate the person who should be employed by the railroad company.

If, in your judgment and opinion, there is not sufficient ground granted or extended to elevator or warehouse operators at this point to properly handle and ship the grain received there, the board will be glad to render you assistance in procuring such additional grounds as may be necessary to that end, but it would not be inclined to interfere with the railroad company with reference to whom such additional grounds or privilege should be extended.

We should be pleased to hear from you further with reference to this matter, and will render you any aid or assistance that we may be able to in the premises.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2041—1899.

CITY OF OELWEIN,

v.

CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY  
COMPANY.

Complaint filed March 9, 1899.

Improper construction of viaduct.

This was a complaint filed by Mr. William A. Reed, city clerk, that the viaduct constructed by the Chicago Great Western railway, in the city of Oelwein, was so built that when snow was left on the top and it thawed the water ran down onto the heads of the people who were compelled to walk through the viaduct; that the water also ran down the north wall and flooded the sidewalk; that the drainage was such that the water was not carried off of the street in warm weather, leaving stagnant pools, and in cold weather freezing and making the walk dangerous.

On March 16th the board were in Oelwein and inspected the viaduct, calling the attention of the railway company to the matter, with some suggestions as to the improvements needed.

The commissioners are informed that the conditions were remedied and cause for complaint removed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.



No. 2042—1899.

NIVER IRON WORKS COMPANY, MUSCATINE,

v.

*Refusal to switch.*

BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS &amp; NORTHERN, RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed March 25, 1899.

On March 25th the board received the following complaint:

*To the Board of Railroad Commissioners:*

We, the undersigned, would respectfully represent that we are engaged in the business of an iron foundry and machine works, under the firm name of the Niver Iron Works company, at Muscatine, Iowa.

Our foundry is located on the side track of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railroad company, on our ground. A side track runs alongside our foundry, on ground belonging to or leased by the said Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern company.

Over three years since, we erected a platform on our ground and alongside the above named side track, and during this period we have received via the said Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern and Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railways, pig iron, coke and various commodities in car load lots. These cars were at all times switched by the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railway to the above mentioned side track and placed at the said platform for unloading.

When cars for the undersigned arrived via the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railway they were handled for them by the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railway under an agreement entered into by and between the two companies.

The Muscatine North & South Railroad company began doing business in this city in January of this year. We recently received via that line a car load of coke in Cincinnati, Cleveland, Chicago & St. Louis car No. 10,247.

On arrival of said car the agent of the Muscatine North & South railroad tendered said car to the agent of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railroad for switching to our side track, tendering at the same time the amount of switching charges that is being charged by said Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern company to said Muscatine North & South company for switching cars to other industries in this city.

The agent of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern railroad refused to perform the service required or to accept any reasonable sum of money for the performance of said service, stating that said track was put in for the benefit of the public as a team track, and was not a private track.

We were forced, therefore, to team said car of coke to our foundry at an unnecessary expense and loss of time. We pray for relief to your honorable body and represent that the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railroad company shows an unjust and unlawful discrimination when it switches for the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railway and declines to perform that service for the Muscatine North & South Railroad company.

Yours very respectfully,

NIVER IRON WORKS COMPANY,  
PER EDWIN NIVER, President.

The complaint was at once laid before the officials of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company, and on April 6, 1899, Mr. W. P. Brady, general agent, on behalf of the railway company, said that the refusal of that company to do the particular switching in question was based on the supposition that all the track which this industry abuts was used for city delivery purposes, but that an investigation disclosed that that part of the track adjacent to the iron works was not accessible enough for that purpose, and, accordingly, instructions had been issued to the agent at Muscatine to switch cars to and from the iron works.

This action of the railway company was communicated to the complainants, who, on April 12th, acknowledged the satisfactory adjustment of the matter, adding "We wish to thank your honorable body for the prompt and satisfactory manner you brought us relief."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2043—1899.

CHARLES H. SIMMONS, MAPLETON,

v.

*Drainage.*

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE &amp; ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed April 10, 1899.

The commissioners received complaints from Mr. Simmons, owning land in section 14-65-43, Maple township, that, about a year previous, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company had placed three culverts under their tracks, draining a large area of land so as to throw the streams across his land; that these streams were making ditches across his land, causing him a great deal of damage. Mr. Simmons claimed that the natural water course had been diverted by the location of the culverts.

The attention of the railway company was directed to the matter at once, and, after some correspondence had been had concerning the case, Mr. Simmons wrote the board, on July 4, 1899, that he had settled with the railway company, receiving a certain amount of money, the culverts to remain as they were already located, adding: "I thank you for the prompt attention you gave my case, for without your help I couldn't have done anything."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2044—1899.

W. DUDLEY, CHURDAN,

v.

*Discrimination in freight rates.*

DES MOINES, NORTHERN &amp; WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed April 13, 1899.

Mr. Dudley made complaint to the board that he had positive proofs that the respondent company were making a better rate from Des Moines to Lohrville than they were from Des Moines to Churdan. The matter was brought to the attention of the railway company, but before hearing was fixed Mr. Dudley advised the board that the case was now fixed satisfactorily.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.



No. 2045—1899.  
JOHANN KARNATZ ET AL., BOYD,

v.

CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY  
COMPANY.

*Petition for depot.*

Filed April 2, 1899.

This matter was presented to the board in the form of a petition, signed by twenty-one citizens of Boyd and vicinity. The petition follows:

*To the Honorable Board of Railroad Commissioners:*

Your petitioners respectfully represent that the Chicago Great Western Railway company is operating and conducting a railway through Chickasaw county, Iowa.

That the town of Boyd is located on the line of railway of said company in Chickasaw county, Iowa, and said town of Boyd is a station on said line of railroad, and so recognized by said company.

That said company has side tracks, a station or small depot in said town, and keeps a station agent at said place, station or town of Boyd.

That the station house or depot of said railroad company at said station is insufficient to meet the public needs and requirements.

That there is no place provided by said company at said station for the comfort or convenience of said passengers.

That there is no waiting-room at said station for the convenience of passengers, and no freight-room so that shippers' goods may be protected from the elements, or such as the public convenience requires.

Wherefore your petitioners pray that your honorable body require said railroad company to provide a suitable depot for said station, such as the public require.

The matter was immediately taken up with the railway company, and Mr. S. C. Stickney, general manager, wrote the board, on May 12th, saying they had "laid out for this year more work than we can possibly accomplish, owing to scarcity of labor and material. Next year we intended to change the track at Boyd, and build new passing track and depot." Mr. Stickney further said: "If we build a depot this year, we will have to move it next year. If, however, it seems to you important, we will try and put up a building this year and move it when we make the track changes."

A copy of Mr. Stickney's answer was sent to complainants, and they were asked if it would be possible for them to wait until the contemplated changes would be made for the depot. It has been several months since the commission wrote the complainants, and no response having been received the case is closed for the present.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2046—1899.

D. W. TOWNSEND, CHEROKEE,

v.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY.

*Estimated weight of brick.*

Complaint filed April 25, 1899.

Mr. D. W. Townsend, of Cherokee, Iowa, wrote the board under date of April 24, 1899, stating in substance that he had been discriminated against for two

years, from the fact that Sioux City brick men were shipping their product at a less weight than he was, and that he now learned that the railroad companies have what is called a weighing association, in which Sioux City is included, and that manufacturers of brick at Sioux City were shipping their brick continuously at four pounds each, without any weighing, and the railway company charging him at the rate of 4.40 to 4.60 pounds each; that his brick are not as heavy as Sioux City brick. He said he had been trying to adjust the matter for three months without success, and asked that the board take action to stop this discrimination at once.

Mr. T. J. Hudson, traffic manager of the railway company, was informed by the commissioners of the filing of this complaint and the board said that if it was found Mr. Townsend was being discriminated against in the manner indicated, it was probably unnecessary to suggest that steps be taken at once to remove cause for complaint. On May 15th Mr. Townsend again wrote the board reiterating his former complaint and demanding some redress. After several letters from Traffic Manager Hudson he advised the board that the investigation was not yet complete and later, on June 15, 1899, he wrote the board saying "that after showing Mr. Townsend that there is no intention to discriminate against him and that we are desirous of arranging matters in a manner that would prove satisfactory to him, he advises us, through our agent at Cherokee, that he will write you to-day withdrawing his complaint. I regret there has been so much delay in the handling of this matter."

On same date Mr. Townsend wrote the board that he had just been notified that his rates and weights had been adjusted and all would be kept on par from this time on, adding "you may mark the claim settled."

Accordingly the case was closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 11, 1899.

No. 2047—1899.

WALTER ADAMS, FAIRFIELD,

v.

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAIL-  
ROAD COMPANY.

*Abandonment of road.*

Complaint filed May 2, 1899.

On April 19, 1899, Mr. W. Adams wrote the board an inquiry as follows:

"The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company propose to straighten and improve their track between Fairfield and Batavia, Jefferson county, and for this purpose have just completed a new survey which gradually leaves the old track until it is about one mile north of the old one, and getting closer to Batavia, the distance varying according to the curve in the old line. The distance between the two points is about ten or eleven miles.

"The property owners along this survey had a meeting to-day and authorized me to ask you if in this case the railroad company has the right to condemn their land, and in case the law should allow them to do so, if there is a limit to the width they are allowed to condemn.

"We would also like to know, in the case of the railroad crossing highways, when they make a cut and it is to the advantage of the public to have the place



bridged, whether the railway company can be compelled to do so, and, if they can, whose duty it is to see that it is done. You will confer a favor by looking into this matter and letting us know your opinion at your earliest convenience."

After giving the matter careful consideration, the board wrote Mr. Adams, a copy of which letter is herewith presented for the reason that it explains the position of the commissioners in matters of this kind:

Mr. Walter Adams, Fairfield, Iowa:

DEAR SIR—Replying to your favor of April 29th, with reference to the right of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company to change its line and the width thereof, your attention is called to section 1995 of the code of 1897, found on page 688, which is as follows:

"Any railroad corporation organized in this state, or chartered by or organized under the laws of the United States or any state or territory, may take and hold under the provisions of this chapter so much real estate as may be necessary for the location, construction and convenience of its railway, and may also take, remove and use, for the construction and repair of said railway and its appurtenances, any earth, gravel, stone, timber or other material on or from the land so taken. The land so taken, otherwise than by the consent of the owners, shall not exceed 100 feet in width, except for wood and water stations, unless where greater width is necessary for excavation, embankment or depositing waste earth."

The commissioners are unable at this time to give a more definite answer to the question respecting the width of land the company would have a right to take, not knowing the conditions which exist at that point or place. However, it would seem from the language of the statute that under ordinary conditions the width of the right of way could not exceed 100 feet.

Your attention is further called to section 2092 of the same code, on page 746, but we are unable to determine at this time whether that section is applicable to the question submitted in your letter, but, from a careful reading of the section and also of your letter, we are inclined to believe that it is. This section is as follows:

"Any railroad desiring to change or to move the line of its road, after the same has been permanently located and constructed, may file a petition in the district court in any county where the change or removal is proposed to be made, describing with reasonable accuracy that portion of its line which it seeks to have changed or removed, and asking the court to grant authority to make such change or removal. All trustees and mortgagees and other lienholders, and all townships, cities and counties which have aided by taxation to build a road, must be made defendants and served with notices as with other actions."

See also sections 2093 and 2094, page 747.

The question whether or not this section contemplates the change or removal of the entire line of road is in some doubt.

The question with reference to the rights and duties of the railroad company regarding the building and maintaining of an overhead bridge is one that the board would not care to pass upon at this time, as it is the custom, upon questions of this kind, not to express an opinion until an opportunity is given both sides to present such evidence and arguments as they may desire in the matter. In case a controversy should arise between the railroad company and the public with reference to this highway crossing, if the matter is brought to the attention of the board, notice thereof will be given all interested parties and an inspection made by the board, and a full hearing held with reference thereto.

If there is anything further in this matter that you may desire to have further or additional information upon, the same will be given if it is within the province of the board so to do.

Very respectfully,

THE BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS,  
D. N. LEWIS,  
Secretary.

Des Moines, November 3, 1899.

No 2048—1899.

N. G. HARDING, DES MOINES,

V.

DES MOINES, NORTHERN & WESTERN  
RAILWAY COMPANY AND CHICAGO,  
MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY  
COMPANY.

Drainage.

Complaint filed May 3, 1898.

Mr. Harding, in this case, complained that proper outlet was not given through the embankment of the Des Moines, Northern & Western Railway company to a ditch draining his farm; that he had placed tiles to overcome this difficulty and that the section men had torn them out. The matter was brought to the attention of the railway company and Mr. F. C. Hubbell, superintendent, said that Mr. Harding had placed tiles on his farm in such a way as to discharge into one of the deep cuts made by the railway company through his farm; that this was done without the knowledge of the officials of the railway company; that the cut in question had given a great deal of trouble and when the old drains were discovered they were ordered disconnected at the right of way line. That Mr. Harding should have drained his land by following the natural lay of the ground, which would have probably taken a little more tile.

On February 10, 1899, Mr. Harding again wrote the board stating that nothing had been done in his case, and the Des Moines, Northern & Western railway, now being owned and operated by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railway, the case was taken up with General Manager Collins. On May 9th Mr. Collins advised the board that the tile had been placed in its original condition to the satisfaction of Mr. Harding.

The board wrote Mr. Harding, informing him of the statement made by Mr. Collins, and that unless he was heard from to the contrary the case would be closed. Nothing being heard from Mr. Harding the board assumed that the conditions were now satisfactory.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.

No. 2049—1899.

FARMERS' MUTUAL LIVE STOCK ASSO-  
CIATION, KENSETT,

V.

Inquiry concerning elevator sites, ca-  
pacity of elevator, etc.

Filed May 5, 1899.

Under date of May 3, 1899, the Farmers' Mutual Live Stock Association, of Kensett, by Mr. E. Ellingson, president, wrote the board stating that the association desired to build a grain elevator at that place of about 10,000 bushels capacity and of the latest modern plans, but the railway company informed them they must build one of not less than 15,000 bushels capacity. They asked whether the railroad company had a right to dictate the capacity; they said, also, that they were having some trouble in getting a site. The railroad company granted them a



site on the same lots as are now used by them for coal sheds; that there was not room enough for both; that the railway company had not given them definite promise of another site for coal sheds, and that the company had ground south of the stock yards which they wanted for the elevator site, but could not get it. In closing, they said:

"Now, is it not their duty to grant a site where wanted when the ground is vacant, even if they have to condemn a few feet of ground in order to do so?"

The reply made by the commissioners is given in full, as it is in the nature of an opinion of the board in this case from the facts presented by the association:

MAY 18, 1899.

*Farmers' Mutual Live Stock Association, Mr. E. Ellingson, President, Kensett, Iowa:*

GENTLEMEN—Replying to your favor of May 3d, the board is of the opinion that it is within the province of a railway company, in leasing any part of its right of way for elevator or warehouse purposes, to exercise the right of providing any reasonable condition in the construction of the elevator to be located upon its land. In fact this seems to be the plain and universal construction placed by the courts with reference to the rights of the railway companies in matters of this kind. These conditions must be reasonable and such as are required of other elevator or warehouse owners under similar circumstances. It is doubtful if any commission, persons or corporations outside of the railway companies have the right to condemn, or compel the railway companies to condemn, additional station or right of way grounds. The question of the capacity of elevators or warehouses is one that comes before the board frequently, and it has been held by the board that it is a question that the railway companies have a right to stipulate or provide for in leasing of grounds for elevator purposes. The question of capacity is one that you will readily see affects the number of sites that a railway company might be compelled to provide for, and it is undoubtedly the object and purpose of the railway company in requiring to have constructed elevators of such given capacity as would properly provide and take care of the grain handled, stored and shipped at the different stations. An elevator of small capacity would, in many instances, require about the same amount of ground as one of a larger capacity; and, if this matter was left to the discretion of the elevator owner entirely, the railway company might be compelled to lease, if there is any law compelling it to lease, a much larger space if small elevators were permitted to be constructed. However, if you desire, we will take this matter up with the railway company and use our influence in endeavoring to bring about an amicable and reasonable adjustment of any differences that may exist between your company and the railway company, and the board would be pleased to receive any additional communications with reference thereto if, in your judgment, it could be of any advantage to your company. Very respectfully,

THE BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS,  
D. N. LEWIS,  
Secretary.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 7, 1899.

No. 2050—1899.

W. C. GEORGE, COLLINS,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed May 18, 1899.

This complaint was made to the board in person by Mr. George on May 18th. After taking Mr. George's statement, the following letter was sent Mr. W. G. Collins, general manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company:

} Under grade farm crossing for cattle.

"In section 14, township 82 (Collins), Story county, in this state, the line of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company crosses the farm of Mr. W. C. George, and it is claimed by Mr. George that, under an arrangement between himself and your company, it was agreed that he should have such conveniences as he might require, so far as passing over or under your line of railway in order to reach his land, which might be situated upon either side of the track. He informs us that the company is about to construct a waterway or culvert of about three feet diameter. This would not permit stock to pass under your track. It would seem from his statement of the agreement and the consideration therefor that there might be a good deal of merit and justice in his claim, and that the company might be required to give him a better and more suitable place for the use of live stock passing under your track. We take it he would be satisfied if you would construct a cattle pass or way under your track of the dimensions of five feet by six feet. We trust that you will do nothing in this matter until you have fully and fairly investigated the same, and the board would be pleased to have you submit the result of your investigations to it, when the matter will receive further consideration."

Mr. Collins wrote the board on May 31st, saying:

"Upon examination, I find that there is no condition in the deed for right of way through Mr. George's property requiring the company to maintain a cattle pass, and that Mr. George is unable to produce any contract or agreement granting him an under crossing. He has been permitted to use a bridge which now requires renewing, and which is not necessary for a waterway. It has, therefore, been decided to use a thirty-inch pipe and fill the bridge. He has a grade crossing at a point about 200 feet east of this bridge, which is a good, safe crossing, the view being clear in each direction. It, therefore, seems to us unnecessary to provide him with an additional under crossing."

Later, on June 17th, Mr. Collins said that, upon further investigation of the matter, he found that Mr. George was able to produce proof that he had been verbally promised an under crossing by the company's right of way agent, and that in accordance he had directed that the present structure be renewed with a five feet by six feet cattle pass, which Mr. George had said was satisfactory to him. Mr. George was advised of this letter of Mr. Collins, and on June 24th he replied that the cattle pass was quite satisfactory, and, thanking the board for their attention, closed the case.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2051—1899.

P. LYNCH, NEW HAMPTON,

V.

CHICAGO, GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed May 26, 1899.

} Drainage—under crossing.

On May 26, 1899, Mr. P. Lynch, of New Hampton, wrote the board as follows: "Permit me to call your attention to a decision given by your board, which appears in 1889 report, page 978, in regard to an undertrack crossing. The crossing, according to the report, was constructed (except the approach on northeast



side) and accepted by the undersigned. Late last fall the railway company changed its location and its dimensions without my consent, paved the crossing with large stones crosswise which is only eight feet wide and is on a level with the ground on either side, and deprives me of any means of drainage. In frosty weather the cattle cannot cross, as it is covered with ice."

In closing, Mr. Lynch asked the board to go to his place and see the condition his crossing is in.

The case was taken up with General Manager Samuel C. Stickney. Mr. Stickney wrote the board on June 28th, saying among other things that "An investigation shows that the undercrossing is a stone culvert with iron deck. The opening is eight feet wide and seven feet high, with a well paved floor extended out to the right of way line on each side. From our point of view the cattle pass is in excellent condition; it is perfectly dry and gives the best possible drainage for all surface water. It is impossible for the railway company, inside the right of way lines, to improve the conditions at this point, as they are already of the best."

There seemed to be a misunderstanding between the parties. A member of the board viewed the premises in question and wrote Mr. S. C. Stickney, stating that he found the under crossing in good condition, but that on the northwest side of the track, outside the right of way, is a hole that during rains is a very bad place for stock to pass, and that if the railway company would move the fence connecting the opening under the track with Mr. Lynch's land about six rods north of present location of fence, stock would then be enabled to have better ingress and egress to the under crossing; that the commission did not think that any paving would be necessary.

Concerning the matter of drain tiles, the commission suggested that the engineer of the company and Mr. Lynch ought to come to some understanding.

Some further correspondence was had in the matter, and on September 23d Mr. Stickney wrote the board stating that delay in answering the board's letter had been caused by the same getting lost, but that the roadmaster had been instructed to change the fence at the cattle pass so that stock can cross on good ground, which, he says, "I presume was what your letter ordered done. It is our aim to satisfy every complaint, and I assure you the delay has only been due to the large amount of work we have under way."

The board, having heard nothing further from Mr. Lynch, feel assured that their suggestions have been carried out, and the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 7, 1899.

No. 2052—1899.

PIERCE & GLASS, WINFIELD,

V.

BURLINGTON & NORTHWESTERN RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.

*Delay in shipment of tile.*

Complaint filed May 27, 1899.

The complainants in this case say that on Saturday, May 18, 1899, they sold two cars of drain tiles to be shipped to Yarmouth station, ten miles distant. One car was to be sent Monday and the other Tuesday; that the railway com-

pany's agent promised to see they went out on the above dates; that they had the cars loaded and billed out Monday one hour before time for the freight to go, and that on Wednesday, May 22d, trains had all gone and they found the tile still in the yards.

The case was brought to the attention of the railway company, and on June 8th Mr. R. Law, manager, reported to the board that the results of his investigation showed that the agent had not promised to get the shipment of tiles to its destination at any particular time; that the delay occurred by reason of heavy shipment of stock which had to be taken care of, and that tile was forwarded the next day; that the persons were not damaged by the short delay.

Copy of Mr. Law's letter, also statement of agent and others, were sent the complainants, who, upon June 12th, wrote the board that, while the statement of the agent was not exactly the facts, they did not desire to carry the matter any further; that the cars since that time had been moved promptly.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.

No. 2053—1899.

H. F. WALTERS, ROCKWELL CITY,

V.

FT. DODGE & OMAHA (ILLINOIS CEN-  
TRAL) RAILROAD COMPANY.

*Under grade farm crossing.*

Complaint filed June 5, 1899.

On June 5th Mr. J. C. Rose, of Des Moines, in behalf of his uncle Mr. H. F. Walters, filed complaint in substance as follows:

That Mr. Walters is the owner of 400 acres of land near Rockwell City; that line of respondent company will cut through his farm, leaving his buildings and about 15 acres on one side of the right of way and the balance of his farm on the other; that inasmuch as his principal business is raising stock, he needs an under passage way to enable his stock to pass to and from his buildings; that such a passage way could readily be constructed on one side of the creek (Lake creek), as the embankment will have to be very high at this point, and it will cost but very little to provide such passage way for the use of live stock; that the appraisers took into consideration that he would have such passage way for stock when they appraised his damages at \$475, but that the railway company declined to provide such passage way; that he has appealed from the award of the appraisers but will dismiss the same if the undercrossing is provided for him; that the railway company has made arrangements to provide him with regular farm crossing, which will suffice for use of wagons, teams, etc., but that the under passage for stock is absolutely necessary for the proper conduct of his farm.

This matter was laid before Mr. C. K. Dixon, superintendent, Tara, and was later taken up with Mr. C. E. Grafton, engineer in charge, Council Bluffs, who informed the board that Mr. Walters was sick, but that he would take the matter up as soon as possible, and that he would be able to make satisfactory arrangements with Mr. Walters.

Copy of Mr. Grafton's letter was sent Mr. Rose, but no word has been received from the complainants, and it is assumed that the matter has been adjusted.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.



No. 2054—1899.

JOHN LEVERTON, ABBOTT,

V.

*Refusal to allow loading of cars from  
wagons.*

IOWA CENTRAL RAILWAY CO.

Complaint filed June 6, 1899.

Mr. John Leverton on June 5th wrote the board asking whether the railway company could prevent him driving behind his elevator with team and wagon and load cars to accommodate the farmers, "when I am taking in all the grain I can handle."

Mr. J. N. Tittlemore, acting general manager of the Iowa Central, was asked to advise the board of the situation at this station, and on June 28, 1899, Mr. Tittlemore wrote the board as follows:

"Referring to your favors of the 8th and 21st insts., relative to the complaint of John Leverton, at Abbott, in which he asked whether the railroad company can prevent him from driving around behind his elevator to load cars in order to accommodate farmers, etc., etc., we have had this matter carefully investigated and find the facts to be as follows:

"Mr. Leverton's complaint is evidently based upon a controversy he had with our agent at Abbott with reference to driving between the side track and our main line south of the station in order to load cars. The ground over which Mr. Leverton insisted upon driving is not a thoroughfare, nor can it be made one with safety. Our agent has planted a flower garden at the south end of the station, which very greatly improves the appearance at that point, and in order for Mr. Leverton to get his team where he desired to go, it was necessary for him to drive over this flower bed, which he did, badly disfiguring it. Our agent was not on the ground when it was done, but upon discovering it remonstrated with Mr. Leverton.

"Outside of this Mr. Leverton had no right to drive his team where he did, as the south end of the house track at Abbott is not intended for team track purposes. If he wants to load grain from tracks into cars and will advise our agent of his wants, the latter will see to it that the cars are promptly set where they will be accessible for teams to drive. From the report I have received, I am satisfied that Mr. Leverton's complaint is without reasonable foundation."

Upon receipt of this letter, Mr. Leverton was advised that Mr. Tittlemore had stated that, if he wished hereafter to load grain from wagons into cars and would advise the agent to that effect, he would see that the cars were promptly placed where they would be accessible for teams.

Nothing further having been heard from Mr. Leverton, the case was closed. Des Moines, Iowa, November 3, 1899.

No. 2055—1899.

F. E. HARRINGTON, MARATHON,

V.

*Appropriating land for snow fences.*

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed June 6, 1899.

Mr. Harrington wrote the board that the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company was building a line which had crossed his land; that he had

made optional agreement for the 100 foot right of way, but that now they asked, for the road through his land, 150 feet out for snow fence from October 1st to April 1st, without any pay. That he had offered to accept provided they agree in the deed to pay all damages or strike out the clause; that the railway company would do neither, claiming the law would force him to do it without pay. He asked the board what his rights were in the premises.

On January 10th, in answering Mr. Harrington's letter, the board said:

"Your favor of the 5th inst., concerning your rights with reference to the granting of right of way and other privileges to railway company, has been received and noted by the board. There seems to be but two ways in which a railway company may acquire right to enter and occupy land for railroad purposes, one is by purchase and deed, the other by process of condemnation in conformity with law. If neither of these methods have been used in obtaining your land, then it would seem the railroad company would be a trespasser if it attempted to enter upon such land without your permission, and, therefore, could be prevented by law from so doing."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 3, 1899.

No. 2056—1899.

TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES, CEDAR RAPIDS,  
BY J. G. GRAVES, CLERK,

V.

*Dangerous highway crossing.*

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed June 7, 1899.

The board, on date named, received the following complaint:

To the Board of Railroad Commissioners, greeting:

We, the trustees of Rapids township, Linn county, Iowa, respectfully petition your honorable body to give to the public some sure method of protection to life and limb at a place on the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railroad, in Linn county, Iowa, where the deep cut is in the E½ of 6-89-7. This is a place where the wagon road crosses the railroad at a point where it is impossible to see the train for any considerable distance on account of an intervening hill, and the steep grade makes it impossible to stop a train coming down the grade after sighting the crossing, before coming directly upon the helpless victim who may be caught thereon. Several narrow escapes from accidents have occurred at this place, and it is a veritable death trap. Complaints having been entered we find it our duty to call your attention to it, feeling certain that our wishes will be looked after, and we respectfully urge your early attention to the matter as it is possible for you to give.

By order of the board of trustees of Rapids township.

J. G. GRAVES, Township Clerk.

June 6, 1898.

The case was at once taken up with the railway company, and, after some correspondence had passed between the board and Mr. W. G. Collins, general manager of the railway company, the commissioners were advised on August 20th that, after a thorough and careful investigation by the railroad company, orders had been given to provide an electric warning bell for the protection of the crossing, the bell to ring automatically on the approach of trains from either direction; that they had a number of these bells in operation and found that they gave satisfaction.



At a later time Mr. Graves advised the board that the bell was not working satisfactorily, and on the 15th of December the board visited the crossing complained of and heard statements of interested parties. The board suggested at that time that the track current of the bell should be extended 1,000 feet further, making the circuit 2,500 feet distant from the crossing bell east, but that 1,500 feet west would probably be ample.

On December 31st Mr. J. F. Gibson, superintendent, who represented the railway company at the inspection December 15th, wrote the board stating that he had made arrangements to take action according to the suggestions made.

In communications to the board during the early part of the year 1899, Mr. Graves, township clerk, reported that the bell was not working satisfactorily; in each case the attention of Mr. Gibson was called to it, and on May 26th he writes the board as follows:

"I find by investigation that this bell is working splendidly. It failed about one month ago for some reason, but I immediately had it repaired, and my section foreman informs me that it never has failed since to his knowledge; he also says that he has talked with Mr. Bleedner, one of the trustees, who says that the bell is working perfectly. The section foreman has instructions to report to me by wire immediately if he finds that the bell fails to work properly."

On June 3d Mr. Graves informed the board that the bell was now working satisfactorily, since which date no complaint was heard from the parties concerned.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 11, 1899.

No. 2057—1899.

M. R. DE BUSK, WIOTA,

V.

*In matter of mail service.*

This was a petition from citizens of Wiota asking that mail be distributed at that station on the early train from the east in order that they might get morning papers and market quotations early enough in the day to be of value.

The petitioners were advised that the board could take no action in the matter of mail service, but that copy of their petition had been sent Mr. W. H. Penn, chief clerk of the railway mail service, who had informed the board there was no agent on duty for that train, but that Wiota was not the only town situated that way; that Anita had hired its own man to look after the mail and Casey and Adair received the mail from the later train the same as Wiota.

In sending copy of Mr. Penn's letter the board suggested that the matter be called to the attention of their congressman, and closed the case as far as the board was concerned.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2058—1899.

PEARSON & HAYTON, PIERSON,

V.

*Overcharge (interstate).*

CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed June 8, 1899.

The complainants in this case said that they had shipped grain to the Peavy Grain company, Chicago; that on shipment of which they complained the contents of the car did not weigh to the amount of the arbitrary minimum fixed by the railway company and they were therefore overcharged to that extent.

The complainants were advised that this was a matter over which the commissioners could exercise no jurisdiction excepting in cases beginning and ending in the state of Iowa, but as was usual in such cases the complaint would be brought to the attention of the railway company, and if possible an amicable adjustment made of the same. During the correspondence that ensued it developed that the railway company issued an order dated April 19th, which fixed a minimum weight on all cars with no marked capacity, 24,000 pounds, with all other cars the minimum weight being 2,000 pounds below the marked capacity.

The railway company furnished the board a copy of their G. F. D., No. 41,401, dated April 19, 1899, covering this point as answer to the claim of Messrs. Pearson & Hayton.

The commissioners feeling that they would be unable to adjust this claim by any further correspondence the papers were returned to the complainants with the advice that the matter properly belonged to the interstate commerce commissioners.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.

No. 2059—1899.

J. V. H. BROWNE, FLAGLER,

V.

*Mirror broken in transit—interstate.*

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAILROAD COMPANY, AND CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed June 13, 1899.

This was a complaint that a mirror was broken in transit from Liberty, Mo., to Flagler, Iowa, for which he claimed damages to the amount of \$6.

Mr. Browne was advised that the shipment was interstate, a class of business over which the Iowa board of railroad commissioners had no jurisdiction; but, following the custom, his claim was presented to the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company, with the statement that, even though the shipment was made at owner's risk, yet it was believed that, if the property was injured in transit while under the control of that company, the claim might be a just one.



The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company claimed the mirror was broken when received from the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company at Ottumwa, and that that company had declined to pay the claim, alleging the mirror to have been improperly packed.

The case was then presented to Mr. H. P. Elliott, freight claim agent of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, who answered stating that the glass was improperly packed, and that the shipper's attention was called to it at the time shipment was made, but Mr. Browne thought by exposing the glass it could be seen, and those who handled it would do so with more care.

Following some further correspondence, the commissioners returned to Mr. Browne the papers he had filed, and advised him of action taken and their inability to bring about any amicable settlement.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2060—1899.

J. B. DOUGLAS, WEST BRANCH,

V.

BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTH-  
ERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Removal of coal shed.*

Complaint filed June 14, 1898.

On date of June 12, 1898, Mr. Douglas wrote the board that he had been notified by the station agent that the railway company were going to remove his coal house from the right of way; that he had leased the house, and he could not afford to have it moved to a new location, and would quit the coal business if it came to that. He protests that he should not be compelled to suffer this loss.

The matter was taken up with the railway company, and Mr. W. P. Brady, general agent, wrote the board on June 18, 1898, concerning the case substantially as follows:

That the coal house was so located as to be dangerous to parties approaching railway track on the principal street of West Branch, as it entirely obstructed the view of trains coming from the south; that it was also in the way of trainmen in switching; that it caused the accumulation of snow in winter; that it was and had been a nuisance for some time; that J. B. Douglas held a lease for the ground on which the building was located which expired December 31, 1899, that in pursuance of the conditions of said lease the railway company had, on April 13, 1898, notified the complainant that it was necessary to remove the building from its present site, and offered to send one of its trainmasters to select a new location for it; that no attention was paid to this notice; that on June 7th the railway company advised Mr. J. M. Lindsley, the agent at West Branch, to notify Mr. Douglas that the building would have to be removed to another location that would be furnished for it if desired; that Mr. Douglas replied there was no other available place for the building, and if it was to be removed he would go out of the coal business and did not care for a new site; that thereupon the building was torn down and the material piled on the property of its owner, a Mr. Wm. Steer, a former resident of West Branch; that the action of the company was entirely within the bounds of reason and common sense, and that if Mr. Douglas had

co-operated with the company, no doubt a proper site could have been selected for a new location.

At a later time, Mr. William Steer called at the office of the board and filed a letter written by Mr. Brady to Mr. Douglas on April 13, 1898, which corroborated Mr. Brady's statement to the board with reference to notice to Mr. Douglas and offer to grant a new location for coal house at a more practical part of the depot grounds.

Nothing further was heard of the matter until Mr. Steer again called on the board, stating that there was some question as to the ownership of the land on which the coal house had been located. Both Mr. Brady and Mr. Steer were asked to state the facts in the case. Mr. Brady said in substance that the company had nothing to say until Mr. Steer had substantiated his claim as to ownership, and Mr. Steer having declined to present any further evidence to the board, the case is closed without prejudice.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 13, 1899.

No. 2061—1899.

P. T. CONROY, WALNUT, IOWA,

V.

CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC  
RAILWAY.

*Overcharge on shipment of stock cattle.*

Complaint filed June 15, 1899.

Mr. Conroy in this case filed with the board an expense bill showing shipment of stock cattle from Dexter to Walnut on which there was a charge made of \$18.68, but which amounts, according to weight of shipment (25,600 lbs.), rate 9.21 cents, to \$17.68. The matter was immediately taken up with Mr. C. J. Phillips, division freight agent of the company, who stated that the matter would receive his prompt attention; that the charge was simply an error in computation, and that the \$1 overcharge would be promptly refunded; and said, further, that if Mr. Conroy had called on the agent the matter would have received prompt attention.

Mr. Conroy was advised of this disposition of his claim, and again wrote the board, on July 11th, as follows:

"Your letter of the 5th inst. at hand, and will say that the legal rate from Dexter to Walnut is only 6 cents per hundred, which would amount to only \$11.97 on 26,600 lbs., when I was charged \$18.68. It seems to me that you could make a clear case out of this, or what is the use of the commissioners if the railway is to have their own way?"

In answer to this letter, the board wrote him as follows:

"Your favor of the 11th received this morning. In this you say the legal rate (on stock cattle) from Dexter to Walnut is 6 cents per 100, which would amount to only \$11.97 on 26,600 lbs., whereas you were charged \$18.68.

"Your expense bill has been sent to the railway company in order that your overcharge might be refunded, but, as I recall it, the weight of your shipment was 25,600 lbs. In this, however, I may be mistaken. I do not know where you get the rate of 6 cents, as the Iowa Schedule of Rates, page v (copy of which is sent you to-day), makes the rate on fat cattle for distance Dexter to Walnut



(fifty-nine miles, taking sixty-mile rate) 9.21 cents per 100 lbs.; 75 per cent of this rate, which stock cattle is allowed to take, would bring it down to 6.9+ cents per 100 lbs.; 26,600 lbs. at 6.9+ cents per 100 would amount to \$18.35. If I remember the weight correctly, however—25,600 lbs.—it would amount to \$17.66, or, if carried out in fractions, about \$17.68.

"You say, 'It seems to me you could make a clear case out of this, or what is the use of commissioners, if the railroad is to have their own way?' I trust the efforts made by this department in this case to have your claim promptly and properly adjusted by the railway company is sufficient answer to your question. Upon receipt of your complaint, the matter was taken up personally with the freight department officials of the company and an explanation asked of the charge made. It was given, and you were advised that the amount of the overcharge would be refunded.

"You have evidently been misinformed as to the rate that should obtain on stock cattle Dexter to Walnut. Even if the rate was 6 cents, as you state you believe it to be, the freight would amount to considerably more on 26,600 pounds than \$11.97. It would amount, at 6 cents per hundred, to \$15.96, or on 25,600 pounds to \$15.36.

"Kindly advise whether the matter is now clear to you.

"Under separate cover I take pleasure in sending you a copy of the schedule of reasonable maximum rates of charges for the transportation of freight in Iowa, as prepared and promulgated by this commission. On pages 5, 6 and 7, you will find the rate quoted on cattle for sixty miles and the note providing for the 75 per cent rate applicable to stock cattle or feeders."

Mr. Conroy wrote the board July 21st that he had been misinformed as to the rate, and that he would settle the claim for \$1.

Mr. Phillips assured the board that the claim would be paid promptly, and nothing further having been heard the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 3, 1899.

No. 2062—1899.

MT. PLEASANT MILLING CO., MT.  
PLEASANT, IOWA,

v.

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAIL-  
ROAD COMPANY.

*Minimum weight on flour in sacks too high.*

Complaint filed June-19, 1899.

The Mt. Pleasant Milling company, on date given, filed with the board complaint as follows:

"The Burlington is charging us freight on the basis of 49 pounds to a quarter barrel sack, when our sacks weigh but 48 pounds gross. Our carload shipments of 500 sacks weigh exactly 24,000 pounds, yet the railroad company insist on 24,500 pounds, and say that the general freight agents of all the western roads, about a month ago, gave instructions to charge for flour on the basis of 49 pounds per quarter sacks and 24½ for ½ sacks regardless of what the sacks weigh. It is our understanding that freight rates are based on weight and not on the number of packages.

"In packing flour in wood it is customary to pack 196 pounds net of flour, and as barrels vary in weight, it seems there is no impropriety in the railroads ruling that flour barrels should be counted as 200 pounds. But when flour is packed in an ordinary quarter barrel sack it is usually the custom in Iowa and Missouri to have exactly 48 pounds, sacks and all, and there is no sense, reason or justice in compelling a shipper to pay freight on 500 pounds which are not in the car."

The complaint was called to the attention of the railroad company, and Mr. J. M. Bechtel, division freight agent at Burlington, was advised that it seemed to the board, without further investigation, if statements in the complaint were true, that the action taken by the railroad company was somewhat arbitrary.

The Iowa classification No. 11 provides that flour in cotton or paper sacks should go at actual weights.

On June 22d the complainants advised the board that they had been notified by the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company that actual weights on such shipments would be accepted.

The case is, therefore, closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2063—1899.

JOHN LEVERTON, ABBOTT,

v.

IOWA CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Condition of stock yards.*

Complaint filed June 19, 1899.

The complainant in this case states that one of the stock yards at Abbott station contains a lot of stones which causes his hogs to get lame. He asked whether he can make the company remove the stones and bury the dead hogs.

Mr. J. N. Tittlemore, acting general manager of the railway company, was notified of the complaint, and the board suggested to him that if anything was piled up in the stock yard that would be injurious to the stock kept there, or that would prevent the free and ordinary use of such stock yards, it should be removed.

After some further correspondence Mr. Tittlemore wrote the board that he had had the matter carefully investigated and, while it was true there had been times in the past when the company had some rock in these yards for the purpose of paving, and that at the present time there were a few stones in the yard about the size of one's hand, he was satisfied that these few stones had never done any damage to any of complainant's stock. Mr. Tittlemore said he had instructed that any stones now in there be taken out at once.

Nothing further having been heard from the complainant in this case it is assumed that the condition of the stock yards is now satisfactory to him.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 3, 1899.



No. 2064—1899.

A. NORELINS, KIRON,

v.

CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY  
COMPANY.} *Location of station.*

Complaint filed June 20, 1899.

The board received the following communication:

KIRON, Iowa, June 19, 1899.

*To the Honorable Board of Iowa Railroad Commissioners, Des Moines, Iowa:*

On behalf of the citizens of Kiron I write you in regard to a railroad station which we expected to be situated in this village of Kiron. The North-Western Railroad company is now building a branch road from Boyer, on Boyer river five miles east of this place, to Mondamin on the western tier of the state, the said road running through our town, and for some reason I don't know, the railroad people located the station one mile west of this place, Kiron, causing a damage to our town and property of several thousand dollars. Their agent who bought up the right of way and land for town site told us that it was sure that the company should put a station at this place, but he thought that the price of land was too high, and it is true that the parties he wanted the land for town site asked a good price, then they came down on the price and he bought an option for \$75 per acre. Still he said it was too high and they had to come down else we could not get the station, and they finally came down to \$60 per acre, and although he promised not to buy land for a station west of us he would let us know it, he went and bought the land without letting us know it, and paid \$80 per acre, and that of a man that asked a most unreasonable price for right of way.

The agent went away, not even telling us that he had bought the aforesaid land. Then we made another concession to the company. We granted them, free, about twenty-seven acres and offered the rest of land they wanted for \$80 and \$75 per acre, but the company would not accept, although we agreed to not sell any land facing this for town lots and building purposes for two years' time. The people here in this neighborhood are very much dissatisfied with this arrangement, as this is the most convenient point for the people to have the town. We have two stores, repairing and blacksmithing shops, good school and church, and two other churches a little way off north and south of the place, and we have had the postoffice here for twenty-six years. I have given you the outline of the transaction of this matter. Much more could be said but I refrain now at present, and I wish to know if anything could be done to reconcile the company. We are willing to do anything reasonable.

Before I close I will ask you a question, which I wish you would answer, and that is, if an elevator or warehouse is erected near a railroad for shipping grain, is it the duty of the company to lay a switch or a side track for that purpose? Yours respectfully,

A. NORELINS.

Copy of the foregoing was sent Mr. J. M. Whitman, general manager of the Chicago & North-Western Railway company, and upon receipt of his answer the board addressed the following letter to Mr. Norelins:

"Upon receipt of your letter concerning the location of Kiron station on the Chicago & North-Western railway, the matter was taken up with General Manager J. M. Whitman of that company, who, under date of July 5th, makes answer as follows:

"In reply to your letter of the 22d of June, in reference to a communication received from Mr. A. Norelins in regard to the location of a station near Kiron, in Crawford county, Iowa.

"The statements made by Mr. Norelins do not correspond with my information on the subject. No definite location for a station on our new line in that vicinity was ever made until it was located at the point where it is now platted, viz., about one mile west of the town at present bearing the name of Kiron. This location was selected because the land at that point was better suited for station

grounds, and a station located there would better accommodate the country tributary to it and would better divide the distance between the stations of Boyer and Schleswig. If the location referred to by Mr. Norelins had been used it would have been impossible to have constructed a side track at that point over 1,100 feet in length without extending it on an eight-tenths of 1 per cent grade, which would not have been feasible. In our preliminary examination throughout that country the people of Kiron (consisting of about one-half dozen) were asked to submit any proposition that they might desire in connection with station grounds. The prices named by them were, as Mr. Norelins states, excessive. No intimation was ever given these people that the company would acquire land for a station at that point at any price, nor were any representations as to location of the station made by any authorized representative of the North-Western company."

"Concerning your question as to whether or not it is the duty of a railroad company to construct a switch or side track to an elevator located on their line we may say that if the railway company at a regular station has not provided sufficient trackage room for the reasonable needs of the public desiring to use the same for the purpose of shipping or receiving freight over the road, the railway company might be compelled to build such track as was needed, providing the conditions were such that it could be done without unreasonably burdening the railway company, or injuring other vested rights which the public might have."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.

No. 2065—1899.

DUBUQUE & SIOUX CITY RAILROAD  
COMPANY AND THE ILLINOIS CENTRAL  
RAILROAD COMPANY,

v.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL  
RAILWAY COMPANY.} *Grade crossing at Storm Lake.*

Complaint filed July 3, 1899.

The petition in this case filed by Mr. John F. Duncombe, attorney, recited in substance that the defendant company, which was building a new line from Rockwell City northerly through Buena Vista county, desired to cross the plaintiff's line of railway at grade at or near the town of Storm Lake; that such crossing would greatly impede the business of complainant and discommodate the public, and that it was practicable to make the crossing either under or over the track of complainant. The complainant asked that the board fix an early date for hearing, and, accordingly, July 7th, at Storm Lake, was announced to all parties. At the appointed time and place the board met the attorneys for the railway companies, Hon. John F. Duncombe for the complainant and Hon. J. C. Cook for respondent company. Witnesses were examined and attorneys argued the case at some length, the respondent company contending that, under the statutes, decision of the supreme court and of the railroad commission, it had a right to cross at grade, or, if not at grade, the complainant should either raise or lower its track to permit of the track of the new line going over or under the same.



The commissioners took the case under advisement, but on July 15, 1899, were informed that the matter had been amicably adjusted between the companies, and that the board need take no further cognizance of the case. It is, therefore, closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 13, 1899.

No. 2066—1899.

FT. DODGE & OMAHA RAILROAD COMPANY (ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY),

v.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed July 7, 1899.

The complainant in this case filed the following complaint or petition with the board on date named:

Comes now the Fort Dodge & Omaha Railroad company and represents to the board of railroad commissioners of Iowa that the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad company owns a line of railway passing through the county of Crawford, in said state, and passing through the town of Arion, at which point it crosses the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company's main line of road; that the Fort Dodge & Omaha Railroad company is a company organized for the construction of a railroad from a point near Tara through the counties of Webster, Calhoun, Sac, Crawford, Harrison and Pottawattamie to the city of Omaha via the city of Council Bluffs, and that said line passes through the town of Arion in said county of Crawford; that said line of road is being constructed by your petitioner railroad company with a view to having the same operated by the Illinois Central Railroad company as a part of a main line from the city of Omaha to the city of Chicago, and from the city of Omaha to New Orleans, Louisville, Memphis and other cities.

That your petitioner had supposed that the terms under which the crossing was to be made had been substantially settled, and unexpectedly a writ of injunction was served upon your petitioner to prevent a crossing at the point designated in said town of Arion, about 238 feet from the center of the intersection of the Chicago & North-Western Railway company's line with the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company's line to the center of the east track of your petitioner's line.

Your petitioner has commenced proceedings for the condemnation of said railway crossing for its double track railroad, and for the assessment of damage thereon, and that condemnation proceedings will take place on the 19th day of July, 1899, at 10 o'clock A. M. of said day, at said point of crossing.

Your petitioner further represents that said crossing of the Chicago & North-Western Railway company's line with the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company's line is a grade crossing, and that the condemnation proceedings sought in this case are also at a common grade; that the nature of the ground is such, and the position of the three railroad lines is such that an overhead crossing cannot be made at this point to be of any advantage to the said Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad company; and that it is not practicable for said company to make either an over or under crossing at the point of crossing; that on account of the location of the bluffs and of the Chicago & North-Western Railway company's line it is not reasonably possible for your petitioner to cross at a point any considerable distance from the point already designated.

Your petitioner further represents that by law it has a right to make a crossing at a reasonable point and upon reasonable terms on and across the right of way and tracks of said Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company.

Your petitioner further states that the sum of \$25,000 has already been paid for the right of way condemnation, etc., at the point designated, and over \$10,000 in construction of the line to said point, and that, under the present condition of the work on said line, and your petitioner having been misled as aforesaid, it becomes necessary that immediate action be

*Grade crossing at Arion.*

taken to determine the proper location of the crossing of your petitioner with its line of railroad over the line of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company and over its right of way.

Your petitioner further states that it has sent to J. C. Cook, Esq., attorney for said Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, a copy of this application, and your petitioner respectfully asks your honorable board for a meeting of your honorable board at said crossing to determine the location and proper method of making said crossing, the amount necessarily required for that purpose, the kind of a crossing that shall be made and the share of expense which shall be required to be paid by the parties hereto.

Signed July 6, 1899.

THE FORT DODGE & OMAHA RAILROAD COMPANY

By J. F. DUNCOMBE,  
Its President.

The complainant in this case is the organization building a new line from Tara to Omaha, to be operated by the Illinois Central Railroad company.

The case was at once taken up with the respondent railway company, and hearing set for Tuesday, July 11th. All parties were notified.

Subsequent to inspection and hearing, and before the board promulgated its decision, the attorneys for the railroad companies notified the commissioners that the matter had been amicably adjusted between the companies, and in accordance therewith the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 13, 1899.

No. 2067—1899.

W. Q. WHITE AND OTHERS, ELLSTON,

v.

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAILWAY COMPANY, HUMESTON & SHENANDOAH RAILROAD COMPANY.

*Application of class "A" freight rates to the Humeston & Shenandoah Railroad company.*

Petition filed July 19, 1899.

On date named the board received the following petition from shippers and merchants of Ellston, Iowa:

"We, the undersigned patrons of the Humeston & Shenandoah railway (Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railway company owners), do petition and pray that you take steps to have adjusted the excessive and unjust freight and passenger rates charged by said railway company. Freight rates are fully 20 per cent higher than are charged on competing, paralleling and neighboring lines.

"Passenger rates charged 4 cents per mile, unless round trip ticket is purchased.

Signed by W. Q. White, A. C. Armitage, W. H. Critchfield, J. S. Maxwell, R. D. Grow & Co., N. Ireland, W. C. Brotherton, Johnson & Hess."

This matter presented a difficult question to the board, and after giving it careful consideration they wrote Mr. C. M. Levey, superintendent of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railway company, Burlington, Iowa, stating the nature of the complaint made, and adding:

"The board has had matters of this kind before it upon several occasions and is in some doubt with reference to what they ought to do therein. It is claimed that your line of railway operates this line not only through lease but subsequently that you became the purchasers thereof. In either event it may be quite



a serious question whether the leased line should not be placed in the same class as the main or trunk line, and, if so, but one local rate should be charged upon merchandise passing over both lines.

"We trust that you will give this letter prompt attention, and the board would be pleased to have this matter submitted to your legal department and have you forward its opinion to us with reference to this matter."

Mr. J. W. Blythe, general solicitor of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, wrote the board asking information on the exact questions that the board would like to have the legal department of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy discuss, and on September 20th the board replied as follows: "The question is whether the Humeston & Shenandoah Railroad company, being now owned by the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad company, would have the right to charge a different rate from that charged by the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy company for like distances, and whether, on a shipment originating on either road and ending on the other one, a through rate should not apply and not two locals?"

On September 22d Mr. Blythe wrote the board he would take the matter up and give it his early attention.

On September 30th Mr. C. M. Levey advised the board that the freight department of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy company had decided that, for business reasons, it was expedient that class A rates should be applied upon the Humeston & Shenandoah railway, putting that road, in the matter of rates, in the same situation with the branches of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroad in Iowa; that tariffs accordingly would be filed with the board in a few days. Mr. Levey further said: "I ought, perhaps, to add that our law department advises that the Humeston & Shenandoah is not in exactly the same legal position, relative to the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, as are the so-called Iowa branches; but the question of whether the Humeston & Shenandoah can legally charge class C rates is not a material one, I suppose, in view of the determination at which our people have arrived."

Copy of Mr. Levey's letter was sent the petitioners, and on October 10th Messrs. R. D. Grow & Co., publishers of the Ellston Weekly Register, wrote the board saying: "Your esteemed favor of the 2d received, and in reply would say, in behalf of the people of Ellston, that we thank you for the attention given in this reduction of rates on the Humeston & Shenandoah railroad. We shall receive a benefit from the class A rates."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2068—1899.

L. N. LOCKWOOD, COLDWATER,

v.

IOWA, MINNESOTA & NORTHERN RAILROAD COMPANY.

Under crossing.

Complaint filed July 29, 1899.

Mr. Lockwood, the complainant, wrote the board stating that the Iowa, Minnesota & Northern Railroad company were just commencing to grade across his land for railroad; that he had asked them to put in a cattle run; that the grade will be 5½ feet under the ties, and by scraping out 2 feet it will give 6 feet in the

clear; that the company would not agree to do it; that the greater part of the pasture would be on the opposite side of the railroad from water and buildings. Mr. Lockwood asked what his rights were in the matter. Replying to Mr. Lockwood on July 29th the commission said:

"Answering your favor of the 27th inst., asking whether the board can compel a railroad company to put in an under-grade crossing, beg to say, that section 2022 of the code of 1897 provides for private crossings as follows: 'When any person owns land on both sides of any railway the corporation owning the same shall, when requested so to do, make and keep in good repair one cattle-guard and one causeway, or other adequate means of crossing the same, at such reasonable place as may be designated by the owner. (C. '73, § 1268; R., § 1329.)'

"In a case decided by this commission some years since, they ordered the railway company to put in an under-crossing for stock. The company declined to obey the order of the board, and suit was brought to enforce the same. In passing upon the case the supreme court of Iowa said (State v. B., C. R. & N. R'y Co., 68 N. W. R., page 819):

"One grade crossing for each land owner whose land is divided by the right of way, with gates and grade, is the rule in this state, and it is only when a grade crossing is inadequate that other or additional means may be ordered. Therefore, held, that where the only objection to such a crossing was the inconvenience of opening and closing the gates, it was error for the commissioners to order the railroad to construct an under-grade crossing."

In passing upon another case the supreme court says (State v. C., M. & St. P. R'y Co., 86 Iowa, page 304):

"While there may be cases where an overhead crossing can properly be required, yet in view of the fact that grade crossings are the rule it would require a strong case to warrant the court in holding an overhead crossing to be reasonable and just."

"It would be best for you, if possible, to make some arrangements with the railway company before construction proceeds too far. The crossing might be made a condition of your deed for right of way. Under the law, as you will observe, the railway company must provide an adequate crossing, but unless extraordinary conditions were present, under the decision of the supreme court, this board would hardly be justified in ordering an under-grade farm crossing."

"The board will be pleased to render you any aid within its power, and if you fail to reach a satisfactory adjustment of this matter with the railway company, you may address the board again, should you desire the assistance of the commissioners."

On August 7th Mr. Lockwood again wrote the board, stating that the engineer of the railroad company had informed him they could make but one crossing with gates and without cattle guards. The board, in answering Mr. Lockwood's letter, said that under the statutes of this state perhaps he was entitled to but one crossing; whether that should be a grade or an under crossing would largely depend upon the conditions existing at the point where the crossing was desired; that is, whether it was a suitable place, etc., etc. That in the first instance the land owner had the right to designate where the crossing should be constructed, but in doing that he must indicate a reasonable place. "If you want an under crossing as well as a grade crossing, that should have been designated in the paper that was executed to the railway company giving them the right to cross your land. The statute gives the railroad commissioners authority to act where



there is a controversy between the land owner and the railway company with reference to private or what are known as farm crossings. The statute is silent with reference to whether the crossing shall be a grade, or under or over crossing, but if the point designated is a reasonable one, it is the opinion of the board that the company might be compelled to construct such under crossing."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2069—1899.

E. FAIRCHILD, CHESTER,

v.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL  
RAILWAY COMPANY.

} *Overcharge (interstate).*

Filed August 10, 1899.

Mr. E. Fairchild wrote the board, complaining of an alleged overcharge on a carload of horses to New York. The commission advised Mr. Fairchild that the case which he presented was interstate in its character, a class of business over which this board could exercise no jurisdiction, but that if he would send his expense bill the board would take up the case and endeavor to secure for him a settlement for his claim.

Upon receipt of his further letter of September 4th, the matter was brought to the attention of Mr. A. C. Bird, general traffic manager, as per the following letter: "There is enclosed herewith correspondence which is self-explanatory, being the claim of Mr. E. Fairchild, of Chester, Iowa, for overcharge on car of horses to Walton, N. Y. You will note that Mr. Fairchild states that he was quoted a rate of \$69 from point of shipment to Chicago, but that when he paid the freight your company had charged \$96. Later, he had a friend get a quotation, and the copy of letter from Mr. J. Oleson, of Le Roy, enclosed would indicate \$69 per car. As this seems to the board to have been merely an error of some one in checking up, it was thought you would promptly adjust the matter upon your attention being called to it. Will you kindly advise the board of your action at an early day?"

Mr. A. C. Bird replied on September 15th as follows:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1899.

Iowa Board of Railroad Commissioners, Des Moines, Iowa:

GENTLEMEN—Replying to your letter of September 9th enclosing copies of correspondence with Mr. E. Fairchild, of Chester, Iowa, who claims an overcharge on a carload of horses from Chester to Walton, N. Y.

The subject has had our attention by reason of a claim filed with us by the New York, Ontario & Western—No. 587,894—and the papers were returned to Mr. J. C. Anderson, general freight agent of the above named road, on May 23, 1899. The horses were shipped in Keystone palace horse car No. 345, which was a forty-eight-foot car, and which, according to the interstate tariff, duly published, takes 140 per cent of the standard rate. The standard rate is \$39; 140 per cent is \$96. We have nothing to do with the premium of \$15, or any other amount, charged by the owners of the car for its use. Our interstate tariffs on live stock are well understood. We do not use private or stable cars except at the request of the shipper, and when we ask for such a car we have to take what they give us, long or short. We do not care to use these cars—they are a detriment to the service—because we have good, substantial cars of our own, and can use them without paying mileage to a foreign company, but we accept the onerous conditions attached to this business in order to accommodate people

along our line. There is no reason why our company should be required to accept less than the lawful tariff rate on this shipment. Yours truly,

A. C. BIRD,  
General Traffic Manager.

On September 18th the board sent Mr. Fairchild a copy of Mr. Bird's letter, and his attention was called to the fact that the board had failed to bring about any satisfactory adjustment of the case, and the same would be regarded closed so far as the board was concerned.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 3, 1899.

No. 2070—1899.

J. H. ADAMS, HAVELOCK,

v.

CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY  
COMPANY.

} *Site for elevator—jurisdiction or board.*

Complaint filed August 12, 1899.

On date August 12, 1899, there was filed with the board the following communication, signed by Mr. J. H. Adams:

"Will you be kind enough to meet me at Havelock, Iowa, at your earliest convenience? I have petitioned the Chicago & North-Western railway at this point for an elevator site. The business men of the town have all signed it. I presented the petition according to instructions from the superintendent, and have met with a flat refusal from the railroad company, on the ground that it would damage the present owners.

"Mr. Hodge was to meet me last Tuesday, the 8th inst., and I have waited till this date and had only a minute's talk with him; he would give no answer about site, whatever. I have in my possession evidence that, I think, will meet your approval in granting me a site.

"There is grain going to other towns that should and would come to this place, but on account of the prices paid are taking said grain to other towns.

"The business men say over their signatures that their business is damaged on account of farmers hauling their grain to other places.

"I brought this matter before the railroad company on the 21st inst., and it is about time I was getting some sort of definite answer that is reasonable. If you kindly favor me with your presence here, and you can show that I am not entitled to site, I will not only thank you, but say you have done your duty to all concerned. I am satisfied that when you see and hear the true condition of affairs you will grant site as asked."

At the time the complaint was filed the commissioners were in attendance upon the national convention of railroad commissioners, but upon their return the matter was at once taken up with the railway company and the complainant advised of the action taken, and that if no satisfactory result was reached by correspondence within a reasonable time then the board could fix a date for hearing and meet all parties at Havelock. In writing Mr. Adams the board said:

"It may be well, however, to call your attention to the status of the matter of granting sites for elevator or warehouse purposes in this state. This board has, in other cases, attempted to compel railway companies to grant sites for elevator



purposes, but the courts have decided in favor of the railway companies when such cases were brought to trial for the enforcement of the commissioners' decisions. In what is known as the Nebraska case, being an attempt on the part of the state board of transportation of Nebraska to compel a railroad company to grant elevator site to certain parties, the supreme court of the United States substantially held that the state could not dictate to the railway company, with whom it must do business on its own property, that is, to whom it should lease its property for warehouse or elevator purposes. This board, however, still holds that if a railway company does not furnish sufficient grounds upon its sidetrack for elevator purposes to reasonably accommodate the requirements of the public doing business at that station, it could be compelled to furnish such reasonable facilities. But the commissioners do not believe, under the decision of the supreme court, they would have a right to name any person or class of persons to whom such additional privileges should be granted. In other words, the state, or the commission created by it, would have the right to see to it that the public should have reasonable and ample facilities for doing business at the various railroad stations in the state, but would not have the right to name the parties to whom should be granted the sites necessary for the accommodation of the public, the railway company having the right to designate its own tenants."

On September 5, 1899, the complainant advised the board that he wished to withdraw his application for elevator site at Havelock.

The railway company was duly advised of this fact and the case is closed.  
Des Moines, Iowa, November 7, 1899.

No. 2071—1899.

HENRY REEVES, DECORAH,

v.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Excessive charge. (Interstate.)*

Complaint filed August 12, 1899.

This was a complaint concerning rate on live hogs destined to New England points.

The matter was taken up with the railway company, although interstate in its character, and the commissioners were informed by Mr. A. C. Bird, general traffic manager Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, that Mr. Reeves had made same complaint to the interstate commerce commissioners.

Mr. Reeves wrote the board September 1st, saying that he thanked the commissioners for their offer to take the case up with the railway company, adding: "Please let the matter rest until you hear from me later, as I am going to Chicago and will try to adjust the matter, as it looks favorable just now."

Mr. Reeves has not written the board again, and it is assumed that he made satisfactory adjustment of his claim.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2072—1899.

C. D. BEEMAN, WAUKON,

v.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Excess rate on hard coal (interstate).*

Complaint filed August 16, 1899.

The board received a communication from Mr. C. D. Beeman stating in substance that the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company charged for soft coal from Milwaukee or Chicago to Waukon \$1.70 per ton, and for hard coal \$2 for any size; that pea size is now worth in Milwaukee \$3 per ton net, stove and egg size \$5.25; that the people had no complaint to make about the charges for anything but pea size hard coal, and for that they thought they should not have to pay two-thirds as much as the coal was worth in Milwaukee for bringing it 200 miles.

The commissioners informed Mr. Beeman that, while they appreciated his difficulty, yet they had no authority to make any regulations governing interstate shipments, but that the matter would be brought to the attention of the railway company.

The complaint was sent Mr. Bird, general traffic manager, for such attention as he would be pleased to give it.

Mr. Bird replied at some length, saying among other things:

"The charges made by our company are reasonable. We do not and cannot undertake to make differing tariff rates on the same article because of a difference in value. For example: We charge as much for the coarsest grade of brown sugar as we do for the highest grade of cut loaf sugar. The fact that the tariff rate on a given article for 200 miles amounts to two-thirds of the cost is not an argument. No matter what rates we make on hard coal, the rate for a long haul might reasonably be more than the entire value of the property at the shipping point. Even in the state of Iowa, where rates are excessively low (by comparison), there is no distinction between the various grades of hard coal. The relative value of hard pea coal at Milwaukee and Waukon seems to me to have nothing to do with it. There should be a difference in current values between Milwaukee and Waukon of an amount equal to a reasonable rate of transportation and a reasonable profit or commission to the dealer for handling the business."

Mr. Beeman was advised by the board that the commissioners could carry his case no further, and sent him copy of Mr. Bird's letter.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2073—1899.

J. W. PLUMMER & SONS, NEW HARTFORD,

v.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY.

*Overcharge. (Interstate.)*

Complaint filed August 17, 1899.

The complainants in this case wrote the board, claiming an overcharge on shipment of apples to Chicago.



While the board recognized the shipment complained of as interstate, yet, as is usual in such cases, the attention of the company was called to the matter and the complainants were advised that while the board had no jurisdiction in such cases, yet they would do what they could to have the matter adjusted. On September 9th Mr. T. J. Hudson, traffic manager Illinois Central Railway company, wrote the board as follows:

"Would say that upon taking this matter up I find that there was an overcharge in weight, and it would be proper for Plummer & Sons to present their claim to our agent at New Hartford. Up to the present time they have not done so.

"As you will understand, of course, we are always ready to rectify any mistakes which are made by our employes, and had the complainants in this case come to us their complaint would have had the necessary attention and not made it necessary to have burdened your office with the matter."

Copy of this letter was sent the complainants, their papers were returned to them, and they were advised to act upon the suggestion made by Mr. Hudson.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2074—1899.

HILL & HALL, WESLEY,

v.

CEDAR RAPIDS, GARNER & NORTHWEST-  
ERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

} Opening street across railroad at  
Titonka.

Complaint filed August 23, 1899.

Under date of August 22, 1899, Messrs. Hill & Hall, of Wesley, wrote the board substantially as follows:

We wish a crossing over the Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern railway at Titonka, Iowa. The main part of the town was laid out on the north side of the track, and for reasons, we suppose, calculated to further the interest of the company that built the railroad and that also owns the town site, the depot was placed right at center of foot of Main street, and lumber sheds, coal sheds, elevators and stock yards at foot of other streets. Well, last spring we bought a piece of land, and had it platted, and sold lots, and several houses have been built and occupied, and a crossing is wanted. A road has been laid out by the county from the section line south of our new addition north to the railroad line, and we asked the railroad company for a crossing and they have refused us. All the business men and all the residents except a very few—three or four—have signed a petition asking for the road and crossing. Still the company refuse. Now, would this matter come under your jurisdiction or powers to settle for us and get the crossing that we and all the people want? The only true and real reason the railroad company can have for refusing is that it will hurt the sale of their lots.

On August 30, 1899, the commission wrote Messrs. Hill & Hall that from their letter it could not be determined whether a street or highway had ever been established or condemned over and across the railway company's right of way, and until that was done, according to the decisions of the courts, the company could not be compelled to open a crossing.

They were asked to inform the board whether such street or highway had been legally established over and across the company's right of way at the point where the crossing was desired, and, if so, to send copy of proceedings had with reference thereto, and were advised that, if the matter proved to be in such

shape that the commission could take action therein, the case would be immediately taken up with the railway company, and, if some adjustment was not reached, hearing would be had, and the board would render its decision in writing.

On September 2d, Messrs. Hill & Hall wrote the board stating that the highway had not been laid out over the railroad, but just up to the railroad.

The commission thereupon informed the gentlemen that it was the opinion of the board that, under the law, it would have no authority to order a railway company to open their right of way and construct a crossing over their track until a street or highway had been legally established over and across the railway company's right of way by the authorities having jurisdiction conferred by statute in such matters, namely, the board of supervisors, city and town councils, etc.; that if, after the street had been legally established over the railway company's right of way, the company declined to put in the crossing, the board would, upon request, take up the case, if necessary, hold a hearing and make an order therein.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 7, 1899.

No. 2075—1899.

T. B. JONES, BEACONSFIELD,

v.

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAIL-  
ROAD COMPANY—H. & S. RY. CO.

} Overcharge—two minimums.

Complaint filed August 24, 1899.

Mr. Jones, complainant in this case, said that he had paid two minimum charges of 25 cents on a shipment only passing over the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy and the Humeston & Shenandoah railways, and claimed that inasmuch as the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy own the Humeston & Shenandoah but one minimum should be charged.

The matter of proper rates to be charged by the Humeston & Shenandoah railroad was before the board in another case (W. Q. Smith v. same companies, in this report), and on October 2d the board wrote Mr. Jones as follows:

"Since the receipt of your letter of the 21st, enclosing expense bill showing the charging of two minimums on freight passing over the Humeston & Shenandoah and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroads, the board has been in correspondence with the railroad companies with reference to placing the Humeston & Shenandoah on the same footing as the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, with the result as shown by copy of letter of Supt. C. M. Levey, enclosed herewith.

"Of course, this action in itself does not restore to you the extra minimum paid on the shipment concerning which you wrote, but it is thought by your taking the matter up with Mr. Levey direct, you may have an adjustment made of the claim. For this purpose your expense bill is returned herewith.

"Trust you may secure prompt and satisfactory settlement."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.



No. 2076—1899.

WILLIAM H. PLUMER, LOGAN,

v.

*Location of station.*

FT. DODGE &amp; OMAHA RAILROAD CO.

Filed August 26, 1899.

The board received, on August 26th, a letter from William H. Plumer stating that, "We farmers around this point are in need of a freight switch or spur at New York siding, half way between Woodbine and Logan, and at the overhead crossing of the Illinois Central or Ft. Dodge & Omaha and the Chicago & North-Western." Mr. Plumer stated that they had several times asked the Chicago & North-Western people for a freight switch, and that they sent the traveling freight agent from the east to view the situation last year, but that no action was taken; that now, about one-half a mile from the crossing, the Omaha & Ft. Dodge are putting in a switch, and that he desired to call the attention of the board to the matter before the completion of the new road.

The case was at once taken up with Mr. J. T. Harahan, second vice-president of the Illinois Central, who, under date of September 6th, said: "The construction of the road in question is not advanced far enough to make the location of stations necessary at this time. Mr. Plumer's suggestions will be borne in mind and given attention when we take up this matter."

This answer was communicated to the complainant, who, on the 14th of September, wrote the board saying: "This morning Mr. Munger, traveling freight agent for the Illinois Central, came to me with the copy of the letter which I sent you people, and I explained the matter fully to him. He has decided to put in a stock pen, loading chute, scales and a business track at the most practical place the grade will allow, which will be about three-fourths of a mile above the crossing of the Chicago & North-Western railroad. So this matter has been satisfactorily adjusted and will give us the accommodation sought for." The case is therefore closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 3, 1899.

No. 2077—1899.

E. F. SMITH, WELLMAN,

v.

*Sending cars off own line.*BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTH-  
ERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed August 31, 1899.

On date named the board received the following inquiry from M. E. Smith: "That the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company have plenty of cars on track and refuse having him load any cars for Chicago via Chicago & North-Western Railway company, notwithstanding his order has been on file day after day. What he desires to know is, can they as common carriers refuse him loading Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern cars if they do not produce the Chicago & North-Western cars in a reasonable time?"

The board replied to the above letter, stating in substance that the courts had held that a railway company could not be compelled to send its cars off its lines, although, of course, if it advertises to carry freight to certain points and owns the road on which such shipment is made, it would seem that it is their duty to provide facilities for carrying such freight. Mr. Smith was also informed that the board would be glad to take the matter up with the railway company and endeavor to bring about some arrangement whereby he might make his shipments properly and promptly.

Later the board submitted the case to Mr. Brady, general agent Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company, and on September 11th complainant wrote the board saying: "My friction with the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company has been adjusted. Thank you for your trouble."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2078—1899.

JOHNSON BROS., RIPPEY,

v.

*Scarcity of cars.*CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed September 4, 1899.

The complainants in this case said they were unable to get cars to ship their corn in, and that they would lose money by not meeting their contracts; that they did not like to complain, but were suffering for want of cars.

The complaint was brought to the attention of Mr. C. J. Phillips, division freight agent of the company, who wrote the board on September 12th as follows:

"I wish to acknowledge receipt of your favor of September 4th, enclosing copy of letter written by Johnson Bros., of Rippey, Iowa, complaining of our company for not furnishing them with grain cars as they needed them, and in reply would state that the unprecedented demand for grain cars with which to move the stored grain, which, by the way, includes four years' crops, is such that we absolutely cannot supply the demand. I would state, however, that we have furnished to Rippey station their full share of grain cars, and Johnson Bros., in turn, have got their full share of the cars furnished that station."

Copy of the foregoing was sent complainants, and they were advised of the car famine prevailing throughout the west.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2079—1899.

O. GRAVATT, TRAER,

v.

*Farm crossing—undergrade.*IOWA, MINNESOTA & NORTH-WESTERN  
RAILWAY COMPANY (CHICAGO &  
NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COM-  
PANY).

Complaint filed September 6, 1899.

This was a case arising from the building of the line from Belle Plaine, Iowa, to Blue Earth, Minn. Mr. Gravatt desired that an under crossing be provided



for him, stating that the ground was suitable; that the water for stock was on one side of the railway with a few acres of pasture, while all the rest of his pasture and other farm land was on the opposite side of the track.

The commissioners made an effort to have the matter adjusted between the parties, calling personally on President Marvin Hughitt of the Chicago & North-Western Railway company with reference thereto.

On November 16, 1899, Mr. Gravatt advised the board that, "I am pleased to say we have arrived at a settlement. I get a chute and a grade crossing."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 20, 1899.

□ No. 2080—1899.

A. L. PATTERSON, OWEGO,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL  
RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed September 13, 1899.

Mr. Patterson claims that he had had orders for cars for shipment of wheat with the railway company more than a week and was unable to get any. He was advised by the board that there was a scarcity of cars everywhere, but an effort would be made to have the situation at his station relieved. Mr. W. G. Collins, general manager Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, on September 21st said that they were doing the best they could to distribute cars equitably, and that there had been no discrimination as between the various shippers. Copy of Mr. Collins' letter was sent Mr. Patterson, and, as nothing has been heard since, it is assumed that his wants were reasonably satisfied.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2081—1899.

J. C. PICKERING, CEDAR RAPIDS,

V.

*Inquiry concerning demurrage charge.*

Complaint filed September 14, 1899.

The following correspondence explains itself and needs no comment:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1899.

GENTLEMEN—Please advise me if any railway company has a right to charge anyone for demurrage for goods standing on the car after twenty-four hours, and, if so, how much a car? I understand they charge \$1 a day for the use of the car, but can they charge one firm for the goods standing on the car and let another firm have their goods stand on the car for three weeks and not charge them? And has the railway company any right to unload the goods without first notifying you?

For instance, the goods were consigned to some party at Sheldon, say, for instance, W. A. Miller, and they got there too late and Mr. Miller refused to accept them; have the railway company a right to unload them without first giving the home office a due notice of the goods being on hand and refused?

I wrote the railway company stating that I would give them orders to ship the goods away in a few days, but I understand the goods have been unloaded and put on the ground. Now, would the railway company be responsible if the goods were stolen?

Any information that you can give me on these points will be thankfully received. The same road had let other goods stand on a car for three weeks without charging them any demurrage, and I understand that they have charged us with \$16 demurrage and have unloaded the goods. There is certainly one thing, if they have a right to charge demurrage, they have no right to unload our goods without our consent; at least, they should notify us; that is the way I look at it.

Please let me hear from you by return mail.

Yours very truly,

J. C. PICKERING.

Mr. J. C. Pickering:

DEAR SIR—Answer to your favor of the 13th inst., concerning demurrage charges, etc., has been delayed, owing to the important business before the board, which required their immediate attention.

This board has held in cases submitted to it that a demurrage charge of \$1 per day for the use of the car, after twenty-four hours on side track in suitable place for loading or unloading, would not be an unreasonable charge; but, of course, in making this charge no discrimination must be practiced. The laws of the state are very explicit in forbidding discrimination of any kind whatsoever.

Just at this time the railroad companies are taxed to their utmost capacity to supply the demand for cars for shipment of grain, and it is understood are compelled to enforce prompt loading and unloading of goods in order that shippers desiring to move their grain may be accommodated. It would be manifestly unfair to allow one shipper the use of a car several days when many men were suffering for the want of cars.

We know no law covering the case cited by you, and whether the railroad company would have the right, under all circumstances, in unloading the goods, would have to be determined by the courts. This would be a matter of private right or claim for money damages, and this board, under the law, could not exercise any direct jurisdiction therein.

If you desire to file with this board a complaint against a railway company in these or any other matters, the board will take the same up promptly with the railroad company and endeavor to secure you such redress as may be equitable or possible under all the circumstances.

Very respectfully,

THE BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS.

Des Moines, November 6, 1899.

No. 2082—1899.

In matter of depot facilities furnished by Chicago Great Western Railway company at Sumner, Iowa.

September 16, 1899.

From personal observations a member of the board called the attention of Mr. S. C. Stickney, general manager Chicago Great Western Railway company, to the inadequacy of depot accommodations at Sumner, a junction point.

At this point many passengers wait some length of time for trains, and had but one room. During the winter months the perishable freight, as a rule, was brought into that room for the purpose of protection, and, with that freight in the room, the men and boys smoking and otherwise making it unpleasant, it was not a good place, or a fit place, for women and children to wait for trains.

Mr. Stickney was advised that the board believed it to be the special duty of the railway company to provide a better station; not only an additional room, but a better lighted one.

On September 27th Mr. Raymond Du Puy, general superintendent, advised the board that he would have the matter looked into at once and give reply on the same as soon as possible.

Mr. Du Puy again wrote the board on October 29th, saying that they had investigated the matter, and that it seemed very desirous to enlarge the station



considerably in many ways, but that it was so late in the season that the company felt that the work should be deferred until the following summer.

On November 14th the board informed Mr. Du Puy that it felt the condition should be remedied at once; that the board did not wish to be captious in the matter, but suggested that until the station was enlarged that smoking should be prohibited in the waiting room in the presence of women; that the room is small, and on numerous occasions many people congregate between the arrival and departure of trains and sometimes it is in a very unwholesome condition; that no reflection was intended on the agent at that point, as he has always been found obliging and accommodating.

Mr. Du Puy, on January 20, 1899, thanked the board for calling his attention to the matter, and said that he had issued orders in accordance with the suggestion of the board.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 9, 1899.

No. 2083—1899.

H. F. GASTON, TRAER,

V.

IOWA, MINNESOTA & NORTH-WESTERN  
RAILWAY COMPANY (CHICAGO &  
NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COM-  
PANY).

*Undergrade farm crossing.*

Complaint filed September 19, 1899.

This complaint grew out of the construction of the new line from Belle Plaine northward to Blue Earth, Minn., running through Tama county, in which county Mr. Gaston has a farm of 520 acres which was cut into two parts by the said line of railway, 300 acres being on the east side, entirely cut off from living water, and, as the farm was principally used as a stock farm, it would greatly impair its value as such unless stock might have easy, permanent and constant passage from one side to the other. It was represented by the complainants that there was good opportunity for putting in suitable underground crossing at a nominal expense, and that he was willing to bear some of the burden of constructing such crossing.

The matter was taken up by the board with the officials of the railway company in person, and, as a result of such conference, Mr. J. M. Whitman, general manager, notified the board that they had adjusted the case to the satisfaction of all concerned and that the under cattle pass would be constructed. On November 27, 1899, Messrs. Yoran, Arnold & Yoran, of Manchester, attorneys for complainant, advised the commission that Mr. Gaston had advised them that matters had been amicably adjusted, etc., and that the case would require no further attention from the board.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 28, 1899.

No. 2084—1899.

M. L. SMITH, ELWELL,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL  
RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Site for elevator.*

Complaint filed September 20, 1899.

On date named Mr. M. L. Smith, of Elwell, filed with the board complaint as follows:

"Please note the attached copies of correspondence relative to my application to the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company for parts of business lots on their depot grounds. September 5th, as you will see by copy attached, I made regular application through the railway company's agent, Mr. G. W. Frankenburg, for lot No. 23 and the east half of lot 22, for horse-power elevator. The only point in question is as to whether these lots were previously leased to the St. Paul & Kansas City Grain company before my application. The ground was formerly leased by them, spring of 1898, but nearly a year ago their elevator (an old one, bought cheap and fixed up) burned down, when they leased new ground west of the depot, and now occupy the same since November last and have nothing to do with the old site. As agent for the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company for the last fourteen years, and up to August of this year, 1899, I know that the old lease, which run out October, 1898, was not renewed through this station, and I am convinced, and it seems to me anyone must become convinced, reading over the copies of correspondence pertaining to the whole deal herewith attached, that there was no lease out. The St. Paul & Kansas City Grain company desire to keep out all competition, and will use all means possible to keep me out. I ask for a just hearing in the matter. The lots I have asked for are not occupied, and if the St. Paul & Kansas City Grain company hold a lease for them it is merely to keep others out, it being the most desirable location at the station and theirs the next; they could practically have the station blocked against anyone coming in. If the ground is not leased why should I not have the same?"

"I desire an investigation; perhaps the matter might be settled without much trouble on your part by a little correspondence."

Mr. Smith enclosed the papers referred to in his letter, and the case was laid before Mr. J. F. Gibson, superintendent of the railway company at Marion, Iowa.

In answer to the complaint made by Mr. Smith, the board said, among other things, that, "In one case this board ordered a railway company to grant a certain elevator site, the company refused and the matter was taken into the court, with the result that the state supreme court held that the company could not, under the circumstances, be compelled to lease a site for an elevator. Later, in what is known as the Nebraska case, the United States supreme court held that state boards would have no right to compel a railway company to furnish sites for elevators or warehouses to any certain parties. This board believes, however, that where it can be shown that sufficient facilities are not furnished at any station for the purpose of handling produce for the public, that the public interests would warrant the commissioners in ordering the railway company to grant other and additional sites along its side tracks for the accommodation of the public desiring to ship grain, etc., at such station. But the commissioners do not



believe, under the decisions quoted, they would have the right to designate any particular person or persons to whom this right should be granted—that would have to be a matter between the railway company and the applicant for sites."

After some correspondence was had with Mr. Gibson, he advised the commissioners on September 29th that, "I have this day sent an application to Mr. Smith for a ground lease at Elwell. I think this thing will be satisfactorily settled now."

Mr. Smith wrote the board again on the 10th of October, stating that he had made the application but had not received the lease, and was anxious to begin work on the elevator.

Mr. Gibson's attention was again called to the case on October 15th. He said that he had asked to have the lease hurried to Mr. Smith for elevator site.

Later, Mr. Smith advised the board he had received the lease, and thanked the board for its action.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 3, 1899.

No. 2085—1899.

JAMES CONGER, DES MOINES,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed September 22, 1899.

Mr. J. Conger wrote from Preston, Iowa, whose home address is Des Moines, saying, on September 20th, that he has "held a ticket from Preston to Sabula since 10 o'clock A. M. to-day; it is now 9 P. M. There are a number of trains passing here during the day, but none have stopped. Is there any remedy for this?"

The commissioners, after consulting time tables, wrote Mr. Conger that two passenger trains daily go to Sabula that stop at Preston, one at 1:06 A. M. and one at 8:40 A. M.; and that two freight trains carry passengers to Preston, at 1 P. M. and 4:40 P. M.

He was advised further that his complaint was not specific enough, and was asked further if he had made any attempt to take those trains or had told the agent that he wanted to take one of those trains.

Nothing further being heard from Mr. Conger, the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 8, 1899.

No. 2086—1899.

WALTER E. HAYNES, ATTORNEY, WIL-  
LIAM WESTON, ANITA,

V.

CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Complaint filed September 25, 1899.

The communication to the board concerning the rights of shippers to load cars on track from wagons.

Train service.

Scarcity of cars.

The board took the case up with Mr. C. J. Phillips, division freight agent of the railway company, in the following letter, dated September 25, 1899:

"This office is in receipt of a complaint from Mr. William Weston, of Anita, by his attorney, W. E. Haynes, dated September 19th, as follows:

"Mr. William Weston, a shipper of grain and potatoes, complains that the Rock Island road, and more particularly its agent at this point, is discriminating against him. The agent here is a supply man while the regular man is taking a vacation. Our client has ordered cars every morning (Sunday excepted) for the past three weeks. He has not been given a single car, while the elevators here have been furnished twenty-one cars between them. Moreover, the agent told him that he had no business to buy grain, and would not get a car while he was here. This matter, it seems to me, is an unjust discrimination, and that we are as much entitled to have our orders filled as the elevators, or, at least, a proportionate share of them. Please take the matter up, and it may save the necessity of going into court."

"It would seem, if the statements made above are correct, that Mr. Weston has been hardly fairly treated. The commissioners have always held that track buyers should be furnished their proportionate share of cars during a shortage of equipment to supply the demand; the railway company having the right, of course, to insist on prompt loading of cars.

"Kindly advise the commissioners of the result of your investigations."

On the same day the board wrote Mr. Haynes, stating that the complaint had been taken up with the railway company and it was hoped that the trouble would be at once remedied. Mr. Haynes was also advised that the commissioners had uniformly held "that track buyers, during such scarcity of cars as now seems to prevail, should be furnished their equitable portion of cars, but that railway companies might insist on prompt loading—that is, no more time should be consumed in loading cars on the track than was required for loading from elevators. This latter reservation seemed to be necessary from the fact that many instances were known where parties had held cars for several days to load, while shippers all along the line were suffering from the want of cars in which to ship their produce."

On September 26th Mr. Phillips made the following answer to the complainants:

"The management of our company does not endorse the action of the agent in refusing absolutely to furnish Mr. Weston with cars. He would be entitled to his share of the equipment that we were able to furnish that station, based on his ability to load grain as compared to parties owning elevators. In other words, if the elevators are in a position to load ten cars a day and he only one, he would be entitled to one-tenth of the empties that we were able to furnish, and our agent at that point has been so instructed."

Both Mr. Haynes and Mr. Weston were advised of the matter, and, nothing further having been heard from them, the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.



No. 2087—1899.

W. S. BROWN, MANSON,

V.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COM-  
PANY.

Complaint filed September 28, 1899.

The correspondence which follows is self-explanatory:

MANSON, Iowa, September, 1899.

*Honorable Railroad Commissioners:*

GENTLEMEN—The Boone Valley Coal company, at Fraser, Iowa, telephoned me that the following two cars of coal, Nos. 2464 and 2504, had left their place September 25th and arrived in Ft. Dodge, Iowa, the same day, billed to me. On the morning of the 26th they did not come, and the agent here said he knew nothing about them and could not find out. On the 27th they still did not come.

I telephoned the coal company, and they said they must have been at Ft. Dodge since the 25th. Now, this is the point I wish made clear to me: Can a common carrier leave goods stand at a point until such time as they choose to haul it out? I am out of coal and dare not get any large amount on hand at any one time, because they compel us to rush the unloading of the cars, threatening us with demurrage charges.

I claim damages, according to law, against the company, for they have kept me out of coal forty-eight hours. I have paid the Illinois Central Railroad company over \$700 freight so far during the month of September, and still they rush me all the time to unload cars. Can they collect demurrage from a person that is getting ten to fifteen cars a month? Can they leave my goods at some point until it pleases them to haul it and then rush me to unload?

If it were not for this eternal rushing of one to get the coal unloaded, I could get enough ahead so I would not get out every few days.

The above is not a new thing, but happens nearly every week, and I want to know my rights, if I have any, in the matter.

Kindly let me know whether this is a one-sided game or not.

Very respectfully yours,

W. S. BROWN.

DES MOINES, September 28, 1899.

W. S. Brown, Manson, Iowa.

DEAR SIR—Your letter of the 27th received this morning. In all cases, I may say for your information, railway companies are expected to use all reasonable means to move freight promptly, and any damages caused by delay in shipping for which the railway company is legally responsible might be made the subject of a suit in court for recovery of the same. You understand, of course, that this commission under the law would have no right to render a money judgment in a matter of a private claim.

Concerning the charging of demurrage, it has always been customary, during times of unusual demand for cars, to compel shippers to unload cars promptly, and to do this it has been necessary for the companies to make a charge, usually termed demurrage, for the detention of the car beyond a reasonable time for unloading. The reasonableness of this order has never been questioned, either by shipper or carrier, during times of scarcity of cars, and there may be no occasion for enforcement at other times.

If you desire it, the board will take up the matter with the Illinois Central railway.

Very respectfully,

D. N. LEWIS,  
Secretary.

Demurrage charge.

No. 2088—1899.

GEORGE C. WHITE, NEVADA,

V.

CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY  
COMPANY.

Complaint filed October 5, 1899.

Scarcity of cars. Right of shipper to  
load cars from wagons.

The complainant in this case said that the agent for the railway company had refused to furnish him a car to load grain in while the regular dealers were enabled to get as many as they wanted. He said, further, that he had ordered a car September 15th, but had not received any, while the two elevators get from two to ten cars a day. A telegram was sent General Manager Whitman, of the railway company, asking whether Mr. White could not be accommodated.

On October 6th Mr. Whitman wrote the board as follows:

"Replying to your telegram of the 4th instant, regarding the complaint of George C. White, of Nevada, regarding his inability to procure car for loading grain:

"I have investigated this complaint and find that Mr. White, some ten days ago, ordered a car for the purpose of loading direct from the wagon. As he would not agree to load this car within a reasonable time, and, further, owing to the fact that the elevators at Nevada are full and we are able to load cars at that point two hours after their arrival there, we recognize that it would only aggravate the situation to furnish a car to Mr. White which might be delayed indefinitely, and thereby cause complaint on the part of somebody else, just at this time when our demands for equipment are so heavy. Mr. White has been advised that if he will give us some assurance that there will be no unreasonable delay in loading this car we will endeavor to supply it."

In sending a copy of this letter to Mr. White the board said:

"This board has uniformly held that parties loading cars from wagons should be supplied with cars during so-called famines proportionately with elevators; that is, if an elevator could ordinarily load thirty cars per day while a track buyer could load three, during a scarcity they should be furnished cars at the ratio of one to ten. However, the track buyer, during such scarcity, should load his car within the shortest time possible and not delay the car, say, more than one day.

"This board will be at all times glad to render you any aid possible in this or any other matter coming within their jurisdiction."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2089—1899.

STACY &amp; CO., OSAGE,

V.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COM-  
PANY.

Complaint filed October 14, 1899.

Inquiry concerning shipper's right  
to load from wagons.

Under date of October 6th Stacy & Co. said that the Illinois Central railroad had refused to furnish cars without any reason except to protect the buyers who



rented elevators and locked them up to avoid competition. They asked whether the railway company had a right under the law to refuse them cars.

Replying, it was said that in the opinion of the board the railway company had no right to refuse them cars because they were what is known as track buyers of grain. All patrons engaged in the same business residing along the line of the same railway are entitled to the same treatment.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2090—1899.

AKRON MILLING COMPANY, AKRON,

V.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Scarcity of cars.*

Complaint filed October 14, 1899.

On date named the board received the following communication from the complainants:

"We desire to bring to your notice the car situation in this immediate locality. We are unable to secure one-half enough cars to keep our business going, and, if it continues as it has for the past sixty days any length of time, it means ruination of our business. We can get no satisfaction whatever from the railway company's agents more than that they can do nothing for us. It is not possible that there is such a shortage of cars that the company cannot furnish half enough cars to transact the general business over its system. We are not getting one-third the cars at this point we usually do at this season of the year, which leads us to believe there is discrimination in distribution of cars at this point by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company. At this season we expect some shortage of cars, but when it becomes so that we cannot transact one-third of our business it is not right, and we believe we are being discriminated against by the railway company in the distribution of cars."

This matter was promptly taken up with the railway company, and they were asked to do everything possible for the complainants.

On October 20th, Mr. W. G. Collins, general manager of the railroad, wrote the board that "There is a larger demand for cars on all divisions than we are able to furnish. We are doing everything possible to fill the orders promptly, and are giving Akron station its fair proportion of cars. We hope to be able to furnish a better supply from this time on, as the congested condition is being somewhat relieved." The board sent a copy of the above answer to the complainants, saying: "It may be well to state that your complaint is only one of many that have been presented to this board on the same subject. The board has taken up the matter with the railway companies, and urged that they use the utmost diligence in supplying the Iowa patrons with cars, and the commissioners have been assured that they were doing everything possible to meet the demand and secure prompt unloading of cars by consignees."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2091—1899.

D. B. DOWNEY, ALLISON,

V.

CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

*Right of shipper to choose market.*

Complaint filed October 18, 1899.

Mr. Wm. Bates, of Waterloo, Iowa, wrote to the board that D. B. Downey, of Allison, loaded a car (Chicago, Burlington & Quincy) of mixed oats to be billed to St. Louis. The agent refused to forward the car to St. Louis, saying that grain must be loaded in Wabash cars to go to that point. The case was taken up by telegram with Mr. S. C. Stickney, general manager, asking that he immediately wire the reasons of his company for its alleged conduct in this case. Mr. Stickney answered that there was no ground for complaint; that agent at Allison advised the party who wanted to load Burlington car with oats for St. Louis that he would have to find out about car, and in the meantime car was loaded for Chicago.

The commission ordered an investigation of the matter and wrote Mr. Stickney, on October 23d, as follows:

"The board is informed, and, it believes, credibly, that the car of oats at Allison was loaded in a C., B. & C. car and billed to St. Louis by consignor and that the agent of the railway company refused to ship car to St. Louis, and that this was in pursuance of instructions of the railway company; that upon the refusal, then, car was shipped to Chicago. If this is a substantial statement of the facts in regard to this case it would seem to be needless to discuss the question of the right of the railway company to refuse to receive and ship merchandise under ordinary conditions. It may be conceded that there are exceptions to this rule, but none of them exist in this case. This board has always entertained a high regard for the management of this railway, but it must insist that if any rules or regulations are now in force whereby a shipper of grain or other commodity cannot say where his grain or merchandise should be delivered, such rules and regulations should be withdrawn at once. This matter is not regarded closed by this board until further investigation may be had to ascertain who, if any one, is at fault."

On October 24th the commissioners were advised that the agent at Allison still refused to bill cars as requested by shippers, and Thursday, October 26th, at Allison, was fixed for hearing all parties notified. However, on October 25th, the company forwarded the cars as requested by shippers and cause of complaint was removed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 10, 1899.



No. 2092—1899.

JOHN W. RILEY, DEFIANCE,

v.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.*Scarcity of cars.*

Complaint filed October 22, 1899.

Mr. Riley said that he was unable to obtain cars for shipment of his potatoes, and that the potatoes would suffer great damage from the first cold weather. The attention of Mr. A. C. Bird, general traffic manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, was called to the matter, and he was asked if it was possible that during the scarcity of cars some preference be given perishable freight until at least the balance might be moved and stored.

Mr. Bird on October 28th replied as follows:

"The board is doubtless aware that the object of our official existence is to secure business; that we cannot get it without furnishing cars, and that it is impossible to satisfy everyone under present circumstances.

"I wish to add that since receipt of your letter we have been obliged to issue a blockade notice against shipments of potatoes to Chicago over our line, because we are unable to handle those on hand in our yard. The blockade will be removed at the earliest possible moment, and we will do the best we can to accommodate our patrons."

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2093—1899.

W. S. DU BOIS, ROCKWELL CITY, AND  
M. SLIFE, DEDHAM,

v.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAIL-  
WAY COMPANY.*Loading cars to marked capacity.*

Complaints filed October 22 and 23, 1899.

The complainants in this case wrote the board that the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company had issued orders that all freight be loaded to full capacity as a minimum, claiming that it was impossible to load oats to the marked capacity, which resulted in overcharge. The complainants enclosed copy of notice issued by Armour & Co., of Chicago, to shippers, calling attention to this rule of the railroad company.

While the board regarded this matter as one of interstate commerce, yet, as is usual in such cases, the board had the matter placed before the railway company for an explanation, and the complainants were advised that the board had fixed minimum weights to be applied on the shipments from point to point in Iowa, but that these minimum weights could not be enforced on interstate shipments.

On October 27th there was received from Mr. A. C. Bird, general traffic manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway company, the following explanation: "The extraordinary demand for cars is such as to require us to insist upon loading grain to the full capacity of the car in each case. If, in the case of

oats, cars are loaded to their bulk capacity and our minimum weight is in excess of that, we will be glad to take the matter up and adjust it fairly."

The parties complaining were given copies of Mr. Bird's answer, which closed the case upon the records.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 6, 1899.

No. 2094—1899.

JOHN CRESSWELL, BONAPARTE,

v.

CHICAGO, FT. MADISON & DES MOINES  
RAILWAY COMPANY.*Overcharge—interstate.*

Complaint filed October 23, 1899.

The complainant in this case says that in the spring of 1899 he shipped some stock cattle from Hillsboro to Omaha, Neb.; that he was told by the agent at Hillsboro if he would get the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy agent at Omaha, or the Western Railway Weighing association agent, to make statement that these were stock cattle, and sold as such, he would get a stock cattle rate. This, he says, he did, and filed same with Cartwright (or some such name) at Hillsboro, the last part of June; that the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy agent at Ottumwa told him a few days later that he had O. K.'d the said papers and turned them over to respondent line, and that he had not heard from the case since; that he had asked the agent at Hillsboro for the rebate and papers and that he could get no word from headquarters; that he thought he had waited long enough.

He was advised by the commissioners that the case was one involving interstate commerce, but that an effort would be made to have the matter adjusted, and, in accordance therewith, Mr. E. F. Potter, general manager, was informed of the filing of said complaint.

Subsequent to some correspondence which followed this action, Mr. Potter advised the board that he had finally succeeded in hearing from connecting line, which had returned papers to him, and authority given for the refunding of their proportion of the overcharge; that voucher would be made and check sent Mr. Cresswell immediately. Mr. Cresswell was so informed and the case is closed.

Des Moines, Iowa, November 13, 1899.



---

COMPILED RETURNS  
OF THE  
RAILWAY COMPANIES

---



TABLE 1—CAPITAL STOCK.

RAILROADS.	NO. OF SHARES AUTHORIZED.		PAR VALUE		TOTAL PAR VALUE AUTHORIZED.		TOTAL AMOUNT ISSUED AND OUTSTANDING.		DIVIDENDS DECLARED DURING YEAR.			
	Common.	Preferred.	Common.	Preferred.	Common.	Preferred.	Common.	Preferred.	COMMON.		PREFERRED.	
									Rate.	Amount.	Rate.	Amount.
Ames & College	800											
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	1,020,000	1,314,860	100	100	\$ 102,000,000	\$ 131,486,000	\$102,000,000 00	\$131,486,000 00			2½	\$2,358,435 00
Boone Valley	900				2,000,000		90,000 00					
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern*	300,000		100		30,000,000		5,500,000 00		4	\$ 220,000.00	½2	110,000.00
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern	3,500		100		350,000		205,000 00					
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	937,234		100		93,725,400		93,725,400.00		6	5,238,370 50		
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City	80,000		100		8,000,000		8,000,000 00					
Kansas City, St. Jo. & Council Bluffs	61,534		100		6,163,493		6,050,493 00			257,142 00		
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern	80,000				8,000,000		5,443,800 00		2	108,876.00		
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines					852,000		852,000.00					
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	2,290	1,320	100	100			229,000 00	132,000 00				
Chicago Great Western	300,000	400,000	100	100	30,000,000	40,000,000	21,238,045.00	31,510,342.99	4	498,002.00	5	454,896 00
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul			100	100			46,923,600 00	35,595,400.00	5	2,318,950 00	7	2,278,930.50
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	500,000		100		50,000,000		49,988,300.00	211,700.00	4	1,998,710 00		
Chicago & North-Western			100	100			44,093,365.97	22,398,954.56	5	1,955,620.00	7	1,567,650.00
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	300,000	200,000	100	100	30,000,000	20,000,000	21,403,293.33	12,646,833.29	3½	649,285 00	7	787,976.00
Sioux City & Pacific	60,000		100	100	6,000,000		1,899,400 00	169,000 00			7	11,830.00
Crooked Creek	5,000		100		500,000		225,000 00					
Des Moines, Northern & Western	80,000		100		8,000,000		4,372,500 00					
Dubuque & Sioux City	100,000		100		10,000,000		9,999,600.00			299,988.00		
Stacyville railroad	1,000		100		100,000		50,800 00					
Des Moines Union	20,000		100		2,000,000		400,000 00					
Iowa Central	110,000	74,090	100	100	11,000,000	2,400,000	8,488,683.48	5,670,486.35			1½	85,005 00
Albia & Centerville	4,000		100		400,000		400,000 00		3	12,000.00		
Iowa Northern	20,000		100		2,000,000		90,000 00					
Keokuk & Western	50,000		100		5,000,000		4,000,000.00		1	40,000.00		
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	50,000		100		5,000,000		920,000 00					
Minneapolis & St. Louis	60,000	40,000	100	100	6,000,000	4,000,000	6,000,000 00	4,000,000.00			5	294,583.33
Muscatine, North & South	450,000		100		450,000		450,000 00					
Omaha & St. Louis	25,920		100		2,592,000		2,592,000 00					
Sioux City & Northern	14,400				1,440,000		1,440,000 00					
Tabor & Northern	2,400		50		120,000		23,650 00					
Union Pacific												
Wabash	280,000		100	100	28,000,000	24,000,000	28,000,000.00	24,000,000.00				
Winona & Western	2,000		100		2,000,000		100,000 00					
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.												
Burlington & Northwestern	3,000		100		300,000		156,900 00					
Burlington & Western	300		100		3,000,000		856,801.82					
Total	4,924,398	2,030,180			\$ 454,992,893	\$ 221,886,000	\$476,267,642 60	\$267,620,717 19		\$13,596,767.50		\$8,549,305.83

authorized, 240,000; issued, 17,350. \* Additional common. † Fractional script.



TABLE 2—CAPITAL STOCK.

RAILROADS.	Miles.	AMT OF STOCK PER MILE OF R.D.	Stock repaid in Iowa.	AMT. OF STOCK HELD IN IOWA.	NO. OF STOCK- HOLDERS.	NUMBER OF SHARES ISSUED.										Total cash re- alized.	
						FOR CASH.		FOR CON- STRUCTION.		FOR REOR- GANIZATION.		FOR OTHER PURPOSES.		Total.			
						Com.	Pre'd.	Com.	Pre'd.	Com.	Pre'd.	Com.	Pre'd.				
Ames & College.	1.98	\$ 10,101.01	\$ 30,000.00			34	24										
A. T. & S. P. ....	7,210.86	32,260.00		\$ 421,600	13,534	28								1,019,960	1,314,800	2,334,800	\$ 2,000.00
Boone Valley .....	4.00	300,000.00		50,000.00	15	9										900	25,000.00
B. O. R. & N. ....	1,119.40	4,463.28	6,069,138.00	110,800	384	14		17,350		55,000						72,350	5,800.00
C. R. G. & N. W. C.	181.56	12,406.00	203,000.00	140,800	14	12										58	
C. & O. ....	6,040.33	15,517.00	13,027,830.00	300,700	1,538	19										58	
C. B. & K. C. ....	18.28	44,062.97	*4,434,320.00	500	6	5										58	
K. C. S. T. & O. B.	319.85	19,494.35	*1,119,342.20	100	16	1	5,770			82,634		2,100				577,000.00	
S. T. L. R. & N. W.	225.80	24,109.00	*1,281,002.47	200	6	2				40,000		14,438				64,438	
C. M. & D. M. ....	71.00	12,000.00								8,820						8,820	
Chi. Ia. & Dak. ....	29.04	15,000.00	361,000.00	112,000	18												
Chicago Great W. ....	844.85	62,435.00	28,830,330.05	345,300	2,805	71		431,800						307,085	188,335	595,420	3,809,982.15
C. M. & St. P. ....	6,153.50	13,410.00	*20,835,047.50	2,500	1,520	12	170,840	51,989	127,540	18,970	32,614	106,812	106,335	106,335	106,335	825,130	31,604,317.85
C. R. I. & P. ....	2,928.62	17,073.00		111,500	3,856	18	80,490					419,900				500,000	
Chicago & N. W. ....	5,618.87	13,253.75	15,415,000.91	231,900	4,094	14				26,450		410,231	103,000	13,328	24,086	664,929	2,911,462.14
C. & S. P. & M. & O.	1,425.04	23,934.46	1,784,120.64	10,000	1,122	2	53,461	30,600	40,000	63,800	69,311	29,433		1,080	1,900	29,854	4,314,717.73
Sioux City & P. ....	107.42	19,555.38	*1,549,470.75	100	51	1				17,914						61,100	2,680
Crooked Creek. ....	17.60	12,777.45	245,000.00	66,400	12	3	117			598						610,100	4,350
Des M. N. & W. ....	146.77	29,791.51	4,372,500.00									43,725				43,725	
Dubuque & S. O. ....	590.49	16,677.40	9,527,357.71	800	38							70,996			30,000	99,996	4,990,000.00
Stacyville R. R. ....	7.93	4,408.00	50,500.00	700	8	7				508						508	50,500.00
Des Moines Union ..	70.45	105,105.00	400,000.00	349,900	12	7	4,000									4,000	400,000.00
Iowa Central. ....	625.91	25,154.44	10,886,505.94	3,700	877	4						84,000		96,071		141,500	
Albia & Cville. ....	24.44	16,367.00	400,000.00	1,320	6	1						4,000				4,000	
Iowa Northern. ....	6.33	12,857.01	200,000.00	90,000	6												
Keokuk & W. ....	254.65	19,554.79	2,720,000.00	119	5											40,000	
M. O. & F. D. ....	92.00	10,000.00	920,000.00	100	8	1				9,200						9,200	
Minneapolis & St. L.	11.54	19,540.00			87,700	4,500											
Muscatine, N. & S.	28.07	15,950.00	450,000.00	89,700	4,500												
Omaha & St. L. ....	164.41	15,705.00	1,136,000.00	1,680,000	21	11								2,502		2,502	
Sioux City & N. W.	96.00	15,000.00															
Tabor & North. ....	8.79	2,690.53	23,650.00	5,910	64	30	253			119					150	622	20,150.00
Union Pacific. ....	1,594.00	38,262.00	1,413,523.00	10	1												
Winona & West. ....	113.20	833.30	20,750,068.00	20	1		1,000					380,000	240,000			620,000	53,000,000.00
NARROW GAUGE.																	
Burlington & N. W.	38.73	4,051.12	150,000.00	600,900	219	219	1,569										
Burlington & W. ....	70.70	12,118.84	856,801.83	500	6	5						8,568				1,569	156,000.00
Total. ....	35,964.66		\$148,392,172.39	\$1,283,000.50	501,315,445	140,715	381,147	71,770	1,701,500	489,508	1,617,012	1,619,803	6,369,900	6,169,035	12,538,935		

\* On mileage basis. † Issued in exchange for bonds. ‡ Issued for dividends. a For properties acquired and retiring bonds. b Coal plant. c Divulged. d Debenture stock.

TABLE 3—FUNDED DEBT.

RAILROADS.	Amount of authorized bonds.	Amount issued.	Amount outstanding.	Cash realized on amount issued.	INTEREST.		
					A. V. rate.	Amount accrued during year.	Amount paid during year.
Ames & College.	\$192,340.00	\$106,637,500.00	\$101,930,710.00	\$ 8,917,100.00	6	\$ 5,156,097.17	\$ 5,009,553.84
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.		15,763,000.00	15,763,000.00	7,623,847.50	6	700,400.00	700,400.00
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.	100,000.00	160,000.00	160,000.00	146,040.00	6	2,500.00	2,500.00
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.		102,805,300.00	93,785,000.00	8,300.00	6	4,992,009.34	4,990,700.00
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.	320,000.00	830,000.00	830,000.00	8,300.00	6	49,200.00	49,200.00
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.	7,218,000.00	5,830,000.00	5,830,000.00		6	440,577.49	404,300.00
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.	10,150,000.00	10,150,000.00	10,150,000.00		6	1,418,246.00	1,400,150.25
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.							
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.		245,000.00	245,000.00				
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.		183,874,500.00			6	5,878,213.29	5,994,010.43
Chicago Great Western.		64,715,000.00	64,715,000.00		6	2,950,986.67	2,950,986.67
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	275,453,000.00	84,137,000.00	73,111,000.00		6	4,662,111.33	4,662,392.29
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	42,299,800.00	36,671,500.00	32,935,800.00		6	1,418,246.00	1,400,150.25
Chicago & North Western.	3,250,300.00		3,250,300.00		6	165,370.30	165,370.30
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.							
Sioux City & Pacific.							
Crooked Creek.	5,415,000.00	2,933,000.00	2,933,000.00		6	117,330.00	117,300.00
Des Moines Northern & Western.	6,930,000.00	6,730,000.00	6,730,000.00		6	362,500.00	362,500.00
Dubuque & Sioux City.	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00		6	3,000.00	3,000.00
Stacyville railroad.	800,000.00	671,000.00	671,000.00		6	34,000.00	34,000.00
Des Moines Union.	7,550,000.00	6,650,000.00	6,650,000.00		6	329,809.84	329,866.67
Iowa Central.	60,000.00	57,000.00	50,000.00		6	3,000.00	3,000.00
Albia & Centerville.							
Iowa Northern.	1,880,000.00	1,880,000.00	1,880,000.00		6	82,800.00	82,800.00
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.	44,571,000.00	17,030,000.00	17,030,000.00		6	630,540.00	580,540.00
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	450,000.00	450,000.00	450,000.00		6	11,250.00	11,250.00
Muscatine North & South.	2,378,000.00	2,378,000.00	2,378,000.00		6	93,040.00	95,040.00
Omaha & St. Louis.	1,620,000.00	1,620,000.00	1,620,000.00		6	98,000.00	98,000.00
Sioux City & Northern.	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00		5 1/2	2,565.16	10,000.00
Tabor & Northern.							
Union Pacific.	84,688,300.00	83,134,000.00	83,073,000.00		6	2,600,195.00	2,600,195.00
Winona & West.	1,150,000.00	1,150,000.00	1,150,000.00		6	57,500.00	57,500.00
NARROW GAUGE RAILROADS.							
Burlington & Northwestern.	220,981.53	220,981.53	220,981.53		7	16,998.90	20,198.90
Burlington & Western.	639,458.91	639,458.91	639,458.91		7	42,351.52	2,967.52
Total.	\$782,902,800.44	\$968,025,555.35	\$900,451,406.44	\$27,947,519.23		\$32,725,076.50	\$32,435,809.86



TABLE 4—FUNDED DEBT.

RAILROADS.	MISCELLANEOUS OBLIGATIONS.					INTEREST.		
	Amount of authorized issue.	Amount is- sued.	Am't out- standing.	Cash resal- led on amount is- sued.	Rate.	Amount		Amount paid during year.
						accrued at year close.	at year close.	
Ames & College.....			\$ 40,000.00					
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....								
Boone Valley.....								
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....								
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....								
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	\$10,140,700.00	\$10,140,700.00	32,000,700.00		5	\$1,528,568.75	\$1,000,837.21	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....								
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.....								
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....								
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....								
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	2,823,150.00	2,823,150.00	2,823,150.00		5	141,157.50	141,157.50	
Chicago Great Western.....		1,365,000.00	1,365,000.00			70,858.33	103,375.00	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....								
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	35,000,000.00	33,632,000.00	31,898,000.00	\$32,000,026.98	5	1,463,692.49	1,462,665.00	
Chicago & North-Western.....								
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....								
St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....								
Crooked Creek.....								
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....								
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	10,000,000.00	5,425,000.00	5,425,000.00	5,425,000.00	4	217,000.00		
Stacyville railroad.....								
Des Moines Union.....								
Iowa Central.....								
Albia & Centerville.....								
Iowa Northern.....		1,519,965.74	1,519,965.74		5	88,565.34	88,565.34	
Keokuk & Western.....								
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....								
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....								
Muscatine North & South.....								
Omaha & St. Louis.....								
Sioux City & Northern.....								
Tabor & Northern.....								
Union Pacific.....								
Wabash.....								
Winona & Western.....								
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.								
Burlington & North-Western.....								
Burlington & Western.....								
Total.....	\$98,483,815.74	\$93,005,815.74	\$75,090,015.74	\$97,485,026.98		\$3,503,843.31	\$3,489,599.95	

\*Judgment.



\*Debenture bonds.



TABLE 6—

RAILROADS.	GRAND TOTALS.				
	Amount of au- thorized issue.	Amount issued.	Amount out- standing.	Cash realized on amount issued.	Interest ac- rued during year.
Ames & College			\$ 6,200.00		
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	\$264,088,500.00	\$210,865,500.00	\$ 184,458,710.00	\$ 8,517,100.00	\$ 5,188,182.00
Boone Valley			43,000.00		
Burlington, Ced. Rap. & Nor.		15,763,000.00	15,763,000.00	7,623,847.50	799,400.00
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N. W.	160,000.00	160,000.00	160,000.00	146,040.00	2,500.00
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	151,946,000.00	151,946,000.00	126,437,700.00		6,514,668.09
Chicago, Burlington & K. O.	820,000.00	820,000.00	820,000.00		49,200.00
Kansas City, St. Jo. & C. B.	7,318,000.00	6,338,000.00	5,330,016.48		404,077.49
St. Louis, Keokuk & N. W.	10,150,000.00	10,150,000.00	10,150,000.00		609,000.00
Chicago, Ft. Madison & D. M.					
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota		264,000.00	264,000.00		
Chicago Great Western	2,823,150.00	4,924,659.31	4,248,351.43		228,127.63
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. P.			136,226,500.00		6,890,119.69
Chicago, Rock Island & Pac.		66,081,000.00	66,081,000.00		3,021,845.00
Chicago & North-Western	338,953,000.00	146,239,000.00	134,645,000.00	25,006,013.31	6,932,704.80
Chicago, St. P., M'p'l's & O.	42,229,800.00	26,671,800.00	26,235,800.00		1,448,246.00
Sioux City & Pacific	3,256,320.00	3,256,320.00	3,256,320.00		195,379.20
Crooked Creek					
Des Moines, North'n & West'n	5,415,000.00	2,933,000.00	2,933,000.00		117,320.00
Dubuque & Sioux City	16,930,000.00	12,155,000.00	12,155,000.00		609,500.00
Stacyville railroad	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00		3,000.00
Des Moines Union	800,000.00	671,000.00	671,000.00		34,008.30
Iowa Central	7,650,000.00	6,650,094.91	6,650,094.91		331,820.84
Albia & Centerville					
Iowa Northern	60,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00		3,000.00
Keokuk & Western	1,519,965.74	1,519,965.74	1,519,965.74		88,565.24
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	1,380,000.00	1,380,000.00	1,380,000.00		82,800.00
Minneapolis & St. Louis	44,571,000.00	17,950,000.00	17,800,000.00		659,540.00
Muscatine North & South	450,000.00	450,000.00	450,000.00		11,250.00
Omaha & St. Louis	2,376,000.00	2,376,000.00	2,376,000.00		95,040.00
Sioux City & Northern	1,920,000.00	1,920,000.00	1,920,000.00		86,000.00
Tabor & Northern	50,000.00	54,246.45	50,550.00		3,613.40
Union Pacific					
Wabash		83,134,000.00	83,073,000.00		2,600,195.00
Winona & Western	1,150,000.00	1,150,000.00	1,150,000.00		57,500.00
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.					
Burlington & Northwestern	229,981.53	229,981.53	229,981.53		16,998.90
Burlington & Western	639,458.91	610,655.91	610,660.12		42,351.52
Total	\$806,926,176.18	\$778,833,226.85	\$647,186,850.21	\$ 36,867,872.61	\$37,135,903.10

\* Mileage basis. † Estimated.

## FUNDED DEBT.

Interest paid during year.	AMT. OF DEBT PER MILE OF ROAD.		Amt. of debt rep- resenting road in Iowa.	Interest paid dur- ing year, repre- senting road in Iowa.	Amount of stock and debt.	STOCK AND DEBT PER MILE.	
	Miles.	Amount.				Entire line.	Iowa.
\$ 7,144,549.17	7,205.86	\$ 25,656.00			\$ 417,944,710.00	\$ 58,036.00	
	3.00	14,333.33	\$ 43,000.00		133,000.00	44,333.33	
799,400.00	1,119.40	14,432.69	*13,865,918.26	\$ 666,522.50	23,390,955.28	20,896.00	\$ 44,333.33
2,500.00	18.35	8,000.00	160,000.00	2,500.00	168,500.00	9,184.44	20,896.00
6,690,527.21	6,040.33	20,932.00	*17,574,840.30	*929,983.28	220,183,100.00	36,449.00	9,184.44
49,200.00	1-1.56	4,516.41	†350,960.00	†21,057.60	8,820,000.00	48,578.98	36,449.00
404,200.00	310.85	18,755.08	†1,078,553.05	†74,777.00	11,880,509.48	88,219.43	48,578.98
609,000.00	225.80	44,951.29	†2,293,719.87	†137,623.19	15,593,800.00	69,060.23	88,219.43
	71.00				852,000.00	12,000.00	69,060.23
	38.40	10,000.00	264,000.00	984,000.00	625,000.00	23,674.00	12,000.00
227,276.21	844.85	5,029.00	2,336,593.28	125,470.20	56,996,739.42	67,464.00	23,674.00
7,011,611.42	6,153.50	22,138.05			218,745,500.00	35,548.14	67,464.00
3,054,361.67	2,928.62	22,563.87			116,081,000.00	39,636.76	35,548.14
6,995,417.29	5,016.87	28,173.09	32,769,672.56	1,621,829.90	207,832,999.33	41,426.82	39,636.76
1,460,150.25	1,422.64	18,441.63	1,874,755.92	76,511.87	60,255,926.62	42,376.09	41,426.82
97,500.00	107.43	58,981.10	4,815,347.01	78,038.77	8,496,442.45	79,095.54	42,376.09
							79,095.54
117,320.00	146.77	19,983.64	2,933,000.00	117,200.00	7,305,500.00	49,775.15	
392,500.00	599.59	20,432.58	11,724,170.71	602,500.00	22,250,770.71	37,109.98	49,775.15
3,000.00	7.93	7,954.27	63,077.39	3,000.00	113,877.39	14,360.33	37,109.98
34,008.30	3.70	181,351.00	671,000.00	34,008.30	1,071,000.00	289,459.00	14,360.33
329,666.67	502.90	13,223.20	5,477,683.17	271,536.43	20,809,274.74	41,377.64	289,459.00
	24.44				400,000.00	16,366.61	41,377.64
3,000.00	8.93	7,215.00	50,000.00	3,000.00	140,000.00	20,202.02	16,366.61
88,565.24	254.65	5,885.57	1,018,951.24	60,224.36	5,498,751.98	21,593.33	20,202.02
	92.00	15,000.00	1,380,000.00		2,300,000.00	25,000.00	21,593.33
580,540.00	511.54	34,797.00			27,800,000.00	54,346.00	25,000.00
	28.67	156.95	450,000.00		900,000.00	313.90	
95,040.00	164.41	15,765.00	1,036,075.80	41,343.03	4,968,000.00	30,217.00	313.90
96,000.00	99.00	20,000.00	1,534,000.00	76,953.60	3,360,000.00	35,000.00	30,217.00
10,034.00	8.79	8,903.21	78,259.07	10,034.00	101,909.07	11,593.76	35,000.00
							11,593.76
2,600,195.00	1,787.20	46,430.00	2,010,419.00	100,521.00	135,073,000.00	79,052.00	
57,500.00	113.20	10,159.01	238,736.78		1,250,000.00	11,042.40	79,052.00
29,198.90	38.73	5,935.00	229,981.53	29,198.90	386,881.53	9,989.00	11,042.40
2,367.52	70.70	8,637.34	610,660.12	2,367.52	1,467,461.94	20,756.18	9,989.00
							20,756.18
\$ 39,065,628.85	36,134.63		\$ 106,432,375.26	\$ 5,992,162.68	\$1,603,226,609.94		4,756.18



TABLE 7—STOCKS

RAILROADS.	STOCKS OWNED.			
	RAILWAY STOCKS.			OTHER
	Total par value.	Income or dividend received.	Valuation.	Total par value.
Ames & College.....				
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	\$ 453,300.00	\$ 1,451.00	\$ 31,491.00	
Boone Valley.....				
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	1,598,900.00		1,598,900.00	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....				
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	38,773,944.82	721,793.00	23,802,072.33	\$ 292,000.00
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....				
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.....				55,000.00
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....				7,800.00
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....				
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....				
Chicago Great Western.....	8,862,265.47	13,403.00	673,725.30	517,629.20
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	10,890,950.00		224,568.75	561,830.00
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....				
Chicago & North-Western.....	53,201,882.81	705,712.00		2,402,900.00
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	4,790,444.93	73,680.00	4,319,544.98	
Sioux City & Pacific.....				
Crooked Creek.....				
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....	100,000.00		100,000.00	
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	5.80		5.80	
Stacyville railroad.....				
Des Moines Union.....				
Iowa Central.....				
Albia & Centerville.....				
Iowa Northern.....				
Keokuk & Western.....				20,000.00
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....				
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	324,500.00	5,412.41		
Muscatine North & South.....				
Omaha & St. Louis.....				
Sioux City & Northern.....	1,000,000.00		1,000,000.00	
Tabor & Northern.....				
Union Pacific.....				
Wabash.....	2,621,551.68	74,400.00	10,559.68	2,431,550.00
Winona & Western.....				
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.				
Burlington & Northwestern.....				
Burlington & Western.....				100.00
Total.....	\$122,620,745.36	\$1,595,771.41	\$31,761,467.84	\$6,288,809.20

AND BONDS OWNED.

STOCKS OWNED.		BONDS OWNED.					
STOCKS.		RAILWAY BONDS.			OTHER BONDS.		
Income or dividend received.	Valuation.	Total par value.	Income or interest received.	Valuation.	Total par value.	Income or interest received.	Valuation.
\$ 50,000.00		\$ 3,765,854.74	\$ 28,855.82	\$ 2,931,718.23		\$ 40,360.00	
1,050.00	\$ 215,447.78	15,121,824.61	887,173.14	11,259,892.34	\$ 624,000.00	25,200.00	\$ 624,000.00
	55,000.00						
	7,800.00						
	506,679.60						
2,733.00	235,263.00	8,947,000.00	27,124.99	8,964,373.75	40,500.00	2,073.40	21,350.00
543,917.00		2,707,000.00					
		2,258,000.00	5,650.00	2,258,000.00			
		460,500.00	32,235.00	523,073.13			
	5,024.00						
		582,000.00	20,000.00	562,000.00	9,000.00	540.00	9,000.00
88,686.25	195,556.00	123,000.00		123,000.00	47,000.00		1,001.00
	100.00						
\$ 686,446.25	\$ 1,220,875.44	\$ 33,995,179.35	\$ 1,001,038.95	\$ 26,622,057.45	\$ 720,500.00	\$ 68,173.40	\$ 645,351.00



TABLE 8—RENTALS RECEIVED, RENTALS PAID AND MISCELLANEOUS INCOME.

RAILROADS.	Rentals received from lease of tracks, yards and terminals.	MISCELLANEOUS INCOME.			RENTALS PAID.					For lease of tracks, yards and terminals, etc.
		Gross income.	Expense.	Net miscellaneous income.	FOR LEASE OF ROAD.					
					Let to rent on bonds guaranteed.	Dividend stockholder.	Cash.	Total.		
Ames & College.										
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.	\$ 55,987.58	\$2,793,229.49		\$2,793,229.49						\$ 311,353.79
Boone Valley.										
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.	6,000.00			68,327.85			\$ 14,000.00	\$ 14,000.00		5,269.82
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.	305,546.17			355,726.55			220,780.49	220,780.49		11,619.00
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.	72,101.44			7,130.23					9,536.52	73,180.05
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.	138,182.10			54,672.24					21,069.08	68,434.83
Kansas City, St. Joe & Council Bluffs.										2,532.35
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.										379,078.20
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.	901.08			85,479.46						424,093.25
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.	216,057.75			285,473.36	\$ 242,380.00		188,203.44	490,585.44		394,730.88
Chicago Great Western.	158,158.61			127,869.48			21,919.62	21,919.62		85,374.87
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	32,611.43	138,803.69	\$ 984.21	30,034.55						117,317.24
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.	35,230.15			5,917.51						
Sioux City & Pacific.	14,630.62									
Crooked Creek.										
Des Moines, Northern & Western.				10,169.98						69,132.77
Dubuque & Sioux City.	23,136.51	216.00		216.00						6,324.46
Stacyville railroad.										
Des Moines Union.	163,718.28									
Iowa Central.		19,035.19		19,035.19				85,420.00		25,010.95
Albia & Centerville.		5.00		5.00						
Iowa Northern.										
Keokuk & Western.	11,860.00							3,183.06		1,000.00
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.										
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	120,993.58	48,201.50		48,201.50						55,694.16
Muscatine, North & South.		6.00		6.00						17,471.04
Omaha & St. Louis.										6,000.00
Sioux City & Northern.										5.00
Tabor & Northern.										
Union Pacific.										
Wabash.	94,770.34			21,945.56			703,032.55	703,032.55		186,522.54
Winona & Western.										2,612.03
NARROW GAGE ROADS.										
Burlington & Northwestern.										6,720.42
Burlington & Western.										800.07
Total.	\$1,291,923.61	\$3,093,467.47	\$ 984.21	\$3,963,446.08	\$ 242,380.00		\$1,147,458.00	\$1,458,988.46	\$ 2,314,294.10	



TABLE 9—COST OF ROAD AND EQUIPMENT

RAILROADS.	COST OF CONSTRUCTION.			COST OF EQUIPMENT.		
	Total cost to June 30, 1898.	Total cost to June 30, 1899.	Per mile.	Total cost to June 30, 1898.	Total cost to June 30, 1899.	Per mile.
Ames & College.....						
Atchison, T. & S. F.....	\$389,337,004.84	\$391,528,895.02		\$ 158,880.17	\$ 697,942.98	
Boone Valley.....						
Burlington, C. R. & N.....	167,472.80	167,472.80	\$ 9,170.64	2,500.00	2,500.00	
Cedar Rapids, G. & N.-W.....						
Chicago, B. & Q.....	8,824,822.55	8,847,967.58	48,733.02	167,452.21	167,722.21	\$ 923.78
Chicago, B. & K. Cy.....	11,921,599.52	11,977,748.40	38,352.25	1,528,547.06	1,537,171.82	4,945.06
Kansas Cy. St. Jo & O. B.....	15,783,055.34	15,870,978.72	70,287.77	585,760.66	589,409.84	2,610.32
St. Louis, K. & N.-W.....						
Chicago, Ft. M. & D. M.....		391,834.20	14,842.20		31,476.16	
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	52,888,589.05	54,378,094.02	64,363.92	2,484,566.54	2,632,576.59	3,116.08
Chicago Great Western.....						
Chicago, M. & St. P.....	90,453,668.57	91,944,454.02	31,395.15	15,539,175.53	15,576,728.93	5,318.79
Chicago, R. I. & P.....	144,648,035.23	143,763,256.91	28,655.96	33,668,316.11	34,398,964.70	6,856.66
Chicago & North-Western.....						
Chicago, St. P. M. & O.....						
St. Louis City & Pacific.....	195,877.82	195,877.82	11,123.10	10,077.04	15,185.04	861.16
Crooked Creek.....	7,126,339.88	7,025,677.10	47,868.61	184,131.02	184,131.02	1,254.55
Des Moines, N. & W.....						
Dubuque & Sioux City.....						
Stacyville railroad.....	1,024,000.00	1,079,000.00	291,621.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	3,243.00
Des Moines Union.....	20,382,273.25	19,909,251.48	39,600.96	611,975.82	611,975.82	1,216.86
Iowa Central.....	400,000.00	400,000.00	16,366.61			
Albia & Centerville.....						
Iowa Northern.....	5,084,746.30	5,084,746.30	19,967.58	410,639.49	410,639.49	1,612.56
Keokuk & Western.....	2,408,679.23	2,405,312.81	26,144.70	62,894.84	63,295.03	687.99
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....						
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....		888,202.86			11,797.14	
Muscatine North & South.....	5,070,960.00	5,070,509.23	30,917.00			
Omaha & St. Louis.....	3,380,371.12	3,380,371.12	35,212.00			
Sioux City & Northern.....	80,844.61	82,413.40	9,376.00		6,652.81	756.00
Tabor & Northern.....						
Union Pacific.....						
Wabash.....						
Winona & Western.....						
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.						
Burlington & N.-W.....	341,568.84	341,992.85	8,830.17	85,391.64	85,391.64	2,204.79
Burlington & Western.....	1,356,852.10	1,357,515.23	19,201.06	120,910.52	120,910.52	1,710.19
Total.....	\$760,886,781.05	\$766,091,571.87		\$55,631,219.65	\$57,156,451.74	

\*Actual amount, \$148,892,256.91, which was reduced by credit of \$5,133,000.00.

AND ACTUAL PRESENT CASH VALUE.

GRAND TOTAL COST OF ROAD AND EQUIPMENT.			TOTAL COST OF ROAD AND EQUIPMENT FOR IOWA.			Actual present cash value of road and equipment.	Actual present cash value of other property.
Total to June 30, 1898.	Total to June 30, 1899.	Per mile.	Total cost to June 30, 1898.	Total cost to June 30, 1899.	Per mile.		
\$ 389,495,885.01	\$ 392,226,838.00	\$15,000.00					
26,230,555.31	26,267,859.42	23,466.00					
169,972.80	169,972.80	9,170.64					
206,634,183.10	226,752,657.62	37,538.14	30,693,777.95	31,424,674.70	37,644.25	\$ 188,800.00	
9,002,274.76	9,015,689.79	49,656.80					
13,445,146.58	13,514,920.22	43,477.31					
16,368,816.00	16,460,388.56	72,898.09					
	852,000.00	12,000.00					
	423,310.36	16,034.48					
55,373,155.59	57,010,670.61	67,480.00	27,686,577.80	28,505,335.31	61,669.00		
214,195,294.69	218,506,634.82	35,541.67					
108,992,844.10	107,521,182.95	86,713.94					
178,316,351.34	178,182,221.61	35,512.82	41,841,177.78	41,305,444.07	35,512.62		
56,452,355.66	56,554,650.09	39,753.31					
5,764,127.84	5,768,427.02	53,681.13					
211,954.86	211,042.88	11,984.26	4,317,998.21	4,319,720.56	53,681.13		
7,310,470.90	7,209,808.12	49,123.16	7,310,470.90	7,209,808.12	49,123.16	211,042.88	\$ 128,621.87
21,240,872.54	21,241,775.78	34,527.17	20,764,680.98	20,768,958.27	36,220.35		
110,800.00	110,861.50	13,992.62					
1,036,000.00	1,091,000.00	294,864.00					
20,994,249.07	20,521,227.30	40,804.88	17,292,962.96	16,903,334.93	40,804.47		
400,000.00	400,000.00	16,366.61	400,000.00	400,000.00	16,366.61		
						85,000.00	
5,495,385.79	5,495,385.79	21,580.14					
2,471,574.07	2,468,607.84	26,832.69	2,471,574.07	2,468,607.84	26,832.69		
22,124,185.79	25,853,034.45	50,539.61					
	900,000.00			900,000.00			
5,070,960.00	5,070,509.23	30,917.00					
3,380,371.12	3,380,371.12	35,212.00	2,709,705.49	2,709,705.49	35,212.00		
80,844.61	89,066.21	10,132.00	80,844.61	89,066.21	10,132.00		
1,250,000.00	1,250,000.00	11,042.40					
426,960.48	427,384.49	11,034.96	426,960.48	427,384.49	11,034.96		
1,477,762.62	1,478,425.75	20,911.25	1,477,762.62	1,478,425.75	20,911.25		
\$1,370,524,354.63	\$1,416,449,024.31		\$158,503,021.51	\$197,394,876.98			

†Estimated.



TABLE 10—INCOME ACCOUNT—IOWA.

RAILROADS.	INCOME FROM OPERATION.			INCOME FROM OTHER SOURCES.				Total income.	Deficit.
	Gross income.	Operating expenses.	Income from operation.	Dividends on Iowa bonds owned.	Interest on Iowa bonds owned.	Miscellaneous income less expense.	Total income from other sources.		
Ames & College.....	\$ 5,178.87		\$ 5,178.87					\$ 5,178.87	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	119,095.53	74,212.36	44,883.17					44,883.17	
Boone Valley.....									
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	4,401,394.39	2,942,427.23	1,458,967.16			62,590.93	62,590.93	1,521,558.09	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	16,486.95	13,160.70	3,326.25				2,700.00	6,026.25	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	75,397,682.00	4,250,419.00	1,147,263.00					1,147,263.00	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....	195,688.5	125,722.02	69,966.49					69,966.49	
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....	1200,633.87	182,778.34	17,855.53			1,319.09	1,319.09	19,174.62	
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....	787,538.45	61,938.75	23,605.73			12,355.92	12,355.92	37,961.65	
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	82,881.40	82,399.76	461.64					461.64	
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	34,869.18	21,739.07	13,130.11					13,130.11	
Chicago Great Western.....	2,922,053.62	2,014,864.13	907,189.49	6,701.50			6,701.50	913,890.99	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	9,549,285.49	6,585,387.47	2,663,898.02	690.08	7,372.59	21,583.57	29,646.24	2,693,544.26	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	6,506,404.01	3,691,617.25	2,814,786.76	84,555.62	31,119.70	82,540.23	198,215.55	3,013,002.31	
Chicago & North-Western.....	8,955,741.03	5,586,113.21	3,869,627.82	286,567.78		29,321.91	315,889.69	3,685,517.51	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	770,433.97	428,130.30	342,303.67	35,467.50			35,467.50	377,771.17	
Sioux City & Pacific.....	397,976.38	240,535.10	157,441.28			4,432.90	4,432.90	161,874.18	
Crooked Creek.....	11,565.00	17,362.50	*5,797.50						\$ 5,797.50
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....	523,233.26	331,197.36	192,035.90			10,168.98	10,168.98	202,194.88	
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	2,948,616.73	1,630,412.35	1,318,204.38		32,235.00		216.00	1,318,420.38	
Stacyville railroad.....	7,210.91	6,529.15	681.76					681.76	
Des Moines Union.....	133,713.58	91,696.06	42,017.52					42,017.52	
Iowa Central.....	1,588,674.04	1,052,450.72	536,223.32			18,368.36	18,368.36	554,591.68	
Albia & Centerville.....	40,813.70	33,850.24	6,963.46			5.00	5.00	6,968.46	
Iowa Northern.....	15,659.39	11,858.06	3,801.33					3,801.33	
Keokuk & Western.....	398,825.89	283,121.97	135,803.92					135,803.92	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	209,080.85	17,883.16	91,217.69					91,217.69	
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	469,798.97	322,812.20	146,984.77					146,984.77	
Muscatine, North & South.....	12,278.08	14,425.93	*2,147.85			6.00	6.00		2,141.85
Omaha & St. Louis.....	221,778.62	218,418.50	3,360.32					3,360.32	
Sioux City & Northern.....									
Tabor & Northern.....	13,423.09	8,011.41	5,411.68					5,411.68	
Union Pacific.....	448,450.62	223,605.24	224,845.38					224,845.38	
Wabash.....	179,888.28	212,282.91	*33,394.63						32,894.63
Winona & Western.....	38,250.99	25,918.49	12,332.50					12,332.50	
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.									
Burlington & Northwestern.....	91,578.75	48,165.09	43,413.66					43,413.66	
Burlington & Western.....	101,240.06	91,094.92	10,145.14					10,145.14	
Total.....	\$ 47,097,390.49	\$ 31,321,414.75	\$ 15,774,975.74	\$ 413,982.48	\$ 70,727.29	\$ 242,908.89	\$ 730,318.66	\$ 16,545,628.38	\$ 40,333.98

\* Deficit. † Estimated.

TABLE 11—INCOME ACCOUNT—IOWA.

RAILROADS.	DEDUCTIONS FROM INCOME.						Net income.	Deficit.
	Interest on funded debt accrued.	Interest on interest-bearing current liabilities.	Rents.	Taxes.	Permanent improvements.	Other deductions.		
Ames & College.....				\$ 75.50			\$ 75.50	\$ 5,103.37
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....								44,883.17
Boone Valley.....								
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	\$ 666,522.50		\$ 14,000.00	132,003.26		\$ 13,204.18	825,729.94	695,828.15
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....		\$ 2,500.00				2,500.00	5,000.00	1,026.25
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	929,983.28		49,262.06	175,453.75	*14,259.54	232,530.00	1,401,488.63	*254,225.63
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....	†21,057.60			7,706.20			28,763.80	41,200.69
Kansas City, St. Joe and Council Bluffs.....	†74,754.33		2,628.00	7,790.30			85,172.63	65,998.01
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....	†137,534.00	14,957.09	609.75	5,881.18			158,982.02	121,020.37
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	38,295.83			5,123.33		176.00	43,594.16	43,132.52
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	9,840.00			1,780.19			11,620.19	1,509.92
Chicago Great Western.....	114,063.82	78,182.54		71,043.54			263,289.90	650,601.09
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	1,739,755.22			232,173.23			1,971,928.45	721,615.81
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....			305,585.44	229,857.54			535,442.98	2,477,559.33
Chicago & North-Western.....	1,589,747.37		4,888.81	271,164.36		95,668.33	1,461,468.87	1,724,048.64
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	75,858.09			25,419.83			101,307.92	276,463.25
Sioux City & Pacific.....	146,361.61			15,280.35			161,641.96	232.22
Crooked Creek.....				1,132.44			1,132.44	6,929.94
Des Moines Northern & Western.....	117,320.00			15,084.00			132,404.00	69,790.88
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	602,500.00			104,877.75		46,983.60	754,361.35	596,294.03
Stacyville railroad.....	3,000.00			413.73			3,413.73	2,731.97
Des Moines Union.....	34,008.30	1,200.00		6,809.22			42,017.52	
Iowa Central.....	273,320.83	1,214.68	20,283.12	48,508.91			343,327.54	211,264.14
Albia & Centerville.....				1,482.58			1,482.58	5,485.88
Iowa Northern.....	3,000.00			400.33			3,400.33	401.00
Keokuk & Western.....		60,224.36	2,165.09	17,895.97	19,742.05		100,027.47	35,776.45
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	82,600.00			10,501.88			93,301.88	2,084.19
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....								
Muscatine North & South.....		11,250.00		1,200.00	142.31		12,592.31	14,734.16
Omaha & St. Louis.....	43,718.40	396.06		7,161.50			51,275.96	47,915.64
Sioux City & Northern.....								
Tabor & Northern.....	3,613.50	147.86		197.97	1,568.79		5,528.12	116.44
Union Pacific.....				24,000.00			24,000.00	200,845.38
Wabash.....								32,394.63
Winona & Western.....				1,642.33	50.39		1,692.72	10,639.78
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.								
Burlington & Northwestern.....	16,998.90	22,153.11		1,928.68	*216.96	2,000.00	43,297.65	116.01
Burlington & Western.....	42,351.52			3,152.47			45,503.99	35,358.85
Total.....	\$ 6,766,435.10	213,225.70	\$ 389,422.27	\$ 1,427,141.32	\$ 35,980.04	\$ 393,062.11	\$ 9,214,260.54	\$ 7,917,670.21

† Estimated. \* War revenue tax.



TABLE 12—INCOME

PAYMENTS FROM NET INCOME.						
RAILROADS.	DIVIDENDS ON STOCK.				Other pay- ments.	Total.
	COMMON.		PREFERRED.			
	Rate.	Amount	Rate.	Amount		
Ames & College.....						
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....						
Boone Valley.....						
Hurlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern		\$ 330,000.00				\$ 330,000.00
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern						1,026.25
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....						
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....						
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.....	4.25	26,742.76				26,742.76
St. Louis, Keokuk & N. W.....	2	5,280.48				5,280.48
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....						
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....			4	\$ 227,448.00	\$ 249,001.00	576,449.00
Chicago Great Western.....			7	575,439.95		1,160,972.40
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	5	585,542.45				
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....			7	359,479.82		807,925.53
Chicago & North-Western.....		448,445.71		41,289.94		75,312.47
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & O.....	3.50	34,022.53	7	8,862.04		8,862.04
Sioux City & Pacific.....			7			
Crooked Creek.....						
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....						
Dubuque & Sioux City.....						
Stacyville railroad.....						
Des Moines Union.....						
Iowa Central.....			1.50	70,018.62	11 05	70,029.67
Albia & Centerville.....						
Iowa Northern.....						
Keokuk & Western.....						5,703.73
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....						
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....						
Muscatine North & South.....						
Omaha & St. Louis.....						
Sioux City & Northern.....						
Tabor & Northern.....						
Union Pacific.....						
Wabash.....						
Winona & Western.....						10,689.78
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.						
Burlington & Northwestern.....						
Burlington & Western.....						
Total.....		\$1,430,033.73		\$1,282,523.37	\$ 249,012.05	\$3,078,944.11

## ACCOUNT—IOWA.

FROM OPERATIONS YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1899.		FROM OPERAT'NS YR. ENDING JUNE 30, 1898.		FOR YEAR.		ON JUNE 30, 1899.	
Surplus.	Deficit.	Surplus.	Deficit.	Additions.	Deductions.	Surplus.	Deficit.
365,828.15		\$3,434,275.56		\$ 49,045.83		\$ 2,842,149.54	
1,026.25				1,026.25		1,026.25	
41,200.69		42,705.20				83,905.89	
\$ 92,740.77		\$ 73,631.57				\$ 104,372.34	
126,300.85		168,057.39				394,358.54	
43,132.52		179,065.87		1,351.61	\$ 222,106.63	91.76	
		1,509.92				1,509.92	
74,152.09		316,913.53		74,152.09		391,065.62	
439,356.59							
916,123.11		1,462,302.65			1,146,556.36	1,231,950.40	
101,150.78							
8,629.32		1,432,847.85				1,441,477.67	
6,929.94		21,984.73				25,914.68	
69,790.88		3,716.35				66,074.53	
2,731.97		183.92				2,915.89	
141,234.47		611,081.11			401,329.37	350,986.21	
6,514.12		10,363.50		3,849.33		3,849.38	
401.00				439.40			
32,282.28		37,986.01					
2,084.19		677,910.51				679,925.60	
		14,734.16				14,734.16	
47,015.64							
		116.44				10,958.42	
		10,841.98		116.44			
				606,449.97	104,715.52		
		128,365.28				128,249.27	
		598,308.41				633,667.26	
\$ 2,289,060.41	\$ 344,416.30	\$1,017,327.48	\$3,395,353.56	\$ 825,091.57	\$1,574,807.88	\$ 4,979,522.74	\$ 3,401,734.68



TABLE 13—INCOME ACCOUNT—ENTIRE LINE.

RAILROADS.	INCOME FROM OPERATIONS.			INCOME FROM OTHER SOURCES.				
	Gross amo't.	Operating ex- penses.	Income from operation.	Dividends on stk owned.	Interest on b'ds owned.	Miscellan'ous income less expenses.	Total income from other sources.	Total income.
Ames & College.....	\$ 5,178.87		\$ 5,178.87					\$ 5,178.87
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	26,804,331.57	\$ 17,100,616.99	9,703,714.58	\$ 51,451.00	\$ 69,215.82	\$2,793,229.49	\$2,913,896.31	12,617,610.89
Boone Valley.....								
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	4,796,105.48	8,217,996.25	1,578,109.18			68,328.85	68,328.85	1,646,438.03
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	18,486.95	13,180.70	3,326.25			7,700.00	7,700.00	6,026.25
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	33,163,529.34	19,700,527.91	13,463,001.43	722,843.00	912,373.14	355,736.55	1,990,942.69	15,453,944.12
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....	416,354.28	292,376.80	123,977.48					123,977.48
Kansas City, St. Joe & Council Bluffs.....	2,343,339.87	1,533,132.91	730,186.96			7,130.23	7,130.23	727,317.19
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....	2,311,413.36	1,548,318.88	793,094.48			54,672.24	54,672.24	847,766.72
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	82,861.40	82,399.76	461.64					461.64
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	34,869.18	21,739.07	13,130.11					13,130.11
Chicago Great Western.....	5,854,336.78	4,332,576.79	1,521,759.99	13,403.00		85,470.46	13,403.00	1,535,162.99
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	38,310,632.49	22,776,670.42	15,533,963.07	2,738.00	29,198.39	85,470.46	117,410.85	15,651,372.92
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	30,647,846.48	13,124,331.62	7,522,914.82	308,747.73	113,580.00	285,473.36	707,801.11	8,230,715.93
Chicago & North-Western.....	39,054,953.19	24,360,375.04	14,694,538.15	1,249,689.00		127,869.48	1,377,558.48	16,072,116.63
Chicago, St. Paul, Minn'p'lis & Om'ha.....	10,476,496.98	6,314,606.09	4,161,890.89	73,560.00	5,650.60	80,034.55	159,244.55	4,321,185.44
Sioux City & Pacific.....	531,261.63	331,082.10	210,169.53			5,917.51	5,917.51	216,087.04
Crooked Creek.....	11,565.00	17,362.50	5,797.50					5,797.50
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....	523,233.26	331,197.36	192,025.90			10,168.98	10,168.98	202,194.88
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	2,970,439.56	1,664,352.66	1,306,106.90		32,235.00	216.00	32,451.00	1,338,557.90
Stacyville railroad.....	7,210.91	6,529.15	681.76					681.76
Des Moines Union.....	178,713.58	91,696.05	42,017.52					42,017.52
Iowa Central.....	2,120,575.11	1,518,178.63	602,396.48			19,035.19	19,035.19	621,431.67
Albia & Centerville.....	40,813.70	33,850.24	6,963.46			5.00	5.00	6,968.46
Iowa Northern.....	15,659.39	11,858.06	3,801.33					3,801.33
Keokuk & Western.....	586,508.47	386,797.02	199,711.65					199,711.65
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	209,080.19	117,363.16	91,217.69					91,217.69
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	2,645,064.98	1,516,316.69	1,128,748.29	5,412.41	20,540.00	48,201.59	74,154.00	1,302,902.29
Muscatine North & South.....	12,278.08	14,425.33	2,147.25			6.00	6.00	2,141.85
Omaha & St. Louis.....	482,150.95	474,822.39	7,327.66					7,327.66
Sioux City & Northern.....	888,057.85	196,670.78	141,387.07					141,387.07
Tabor & Northern.....	13,423.09	8,011.41	5,411.68					5,411.68
Union Pacific.....	14,458,733.49	10,569,997.36	3,888,756.13	163,086.25	21,945.56		185,031.81	4,073,787.94
Wabash.....	184,253.81	124,848.19	59,405.62					59,405.62
WINONA & WESTERN.....								
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.....								
Burlington & Northwestern.....	91,878.75	48,165.09	43,413.66					43,413.66
Burlington & Western.....	101,240.06	91,094.92	10,145.14					10,145.14
Total.....	\$209,725,008.89	\$131,953,998.97	\$77,771,009.02	\$2,590,925.41	\$1,304,737.91	\$3,944,194.48	\$7,739,857.80	\$85,510,866.82

\* Deficit.

TABLE 14—INCOME ACCOUNT—ENTIRE LINE.

RAILROADS.	DEDUCTIONS FROM INCOME.							Net income.	Deficit.
	Interest on funded debt accrued	Interest on in- terest-bearing current liab- ilities.	Rents.	Taxes.	Permanent im- provements.	Other deduc- tions.	Total deduc- tions from in- come.		
Ames & College.....				\$ 75.50			\$ 75.50	\$ 5,103.37	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	\$5,188,132.00			1,157,569.24		\$ 74,072.29	6,419,773.53	6,197,837.36	
Boone Valley.....									
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	799,400.00		\$ 14,000.00	146,748.08		13,303.75	973,451.83	672,986.20	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....		\$ 2,500.00				2,500.00	5,000.00	1,029.25	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	6,514,608.06		220,780.48	1,293,923.15	\$ 58,698.94	523,754.94	8,601,734.24	6,562,309.88	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....	49,320.00			16,166.27			65,396.27	58,611.21	
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....	404,077.49		9,536.52	49,289.05			462,903.06	264,414.13	
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....	609,000.00	66,181.80	21,069.98	41,735.80			737,977.58	109,789.14	
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	38,295.83			5,122.33		176.00	43,594.16		\$ 43,132.52
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	9,840.00			1,780.19			11,620.19	1,509.92	
Chicago Great Western.....	225,127.63	156,365.09		204,000.00			585,492.72	946,670.27	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	6,036,800.00			1,186,168.43			8,076,368.06	7,575,086.83	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	3,054,351.67		430,585.44	931,833.89			4,416,771.00	3,813,834.93	
Chicago & North-Western.....	6,932,704.10		21,319.52	1,182,516.48		417,198.55	8,553,739.35	7,518,377.28	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	1,448,246.00			383,551.71			1,831,797.71	2,489,337.73	
Sioux City & Pacific.....	198,379.20		20,397.85				215,777.05	309.99	
Crooked Creek.....				1,133.44			1,132.44		9,929.94
Des Moines Northern & Western.....	117,380.96			15,084.00			132,464.96	69,790.88	
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	609,500.00			107,461.18		46,985.60	763,946.78	574,613.15	
Stacyville railroad.....	4,000.00			413.73			4,413.73		2,791.97
Des Moines Union.....	34,008.30	1,200.00		6,809.22			42,017.52		
Iowa Central.....	331,820.84	1,474.66	35,460.00	65,176.62			433,932.12	187,499.55	
Albia & Centerville.....				1,482.58			1,482.58	5,485.88	
Iowa Northern.....	3,000.00			400.33			3,400.33	401.00	
Keokuk & Western.....		88,565.24	3,183.96	33,226.28	29,032.44		154,007.92	45,703.73	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....				10,501.25			10,501.25		2,084.19
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	659,540.00			84,700.00		213.43	744,453.43	458,448.61	
Muscatine North & South.....		11,250.00		1,200.00	142.31		12,592.31		14,734.16
Omaha & St. Louis.....	95,040.00	861.00		14,172.77			110,073.77	102,746.11	
Sioux City & Northern.....	96,000.00	22,080.00		18,019.77	24,376.54	1,590.40	157,066.71	15,679.94	
Tabor & Northern.....	3,613.50	147.86		197.97	1,568.79		5,528.12		116.44
Union Pacific.....									
Wabash.....	2,600,195.00		703,052.55	667,163.29	55,440.65		3,925,851.49	147,938.45	
WINONA & WESTERN.....				5,431.20	5,673.94		5,673.94	53,751.68	
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.....									
Burlington & Northwestern.....	16,998.90	22,153.11		1,228.68	*216.96	2,000.00	43,297.65	116.01	
Burlington & Western.....	42,351.82			4,152.47			45,503.99		35,358.85
Total.....	\$37,056,740.46	\$ 373,778.76	\$1,479,386.31	\$7,523,221.78	\$169,638.97	\$1,081,702.96	\$47,863,549.24	\$38,050,831.40	\$23,513.82

\* War revenue tax.



TABLE 15—INCOME—

RAILROADS.	PAYMENTS FROM NET INCOME.					
	DIVIDENDS ON STOCK.				Other pay- ments.	Total.
	COMMON.		PREFERRED.			
	Rate.	Amount	Rate.	Amount		
Ames & College.....						
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....			1	\$1,141,657.00		\$ 1,141,657.00
Boone Valley.....						
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & N.....	6	\$ 330,000.00				330,000.00
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N.-W.....						1,026.25
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	6	5,238,370.50				
Chicago, Burlington & K. Cy.....						
Kansas City, St. Jo & C. B.....	4.25	257,142.00				257,142.00
St. Louis, Keokuk & N.-W.....	2	108,876.00				108,876.00
Chicago, Ft. Madison & D. M.....						
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....						
Chicago Great Western.....			4.50	454,896.00	\$ 498,002.00	952,898.00
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	5	2,318,980.00	7	2,278,930.50		4,597,910.50
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	4	1,998,710.00			669,194.21	2,667,904.21
Chicago & North-Western.....	5	1,965,630.00	7	1,567,650.00		3,533,270.00
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneap. & O.....	3.50	649,285.00	7	787,976.00		1,437,261.00
Sioux City & Pacific.....			7	11,830.00		11,830.00
Crooked Creek.....						
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....						
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	3	299,988.00				
Stacyville railroad.....						
Des Moines, Union.....						
Iowa Central.....			1.50	85,005.00	13.41	85,018.41
Albia & Centerville.....	3	12,000.00				12,000.00
Iowa Northern.....						
Keokuk & Western.....	1	40,000.00				40,000.00
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....						
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....			4.50, 5	294,583.33		294,583.33
Muscatine North & South.....						
Omaha & St. Louis.....						
Sioux City & Northern.....						
Tabor & Northern.....						
Union Pacific.....						
Wabash.....						
Winona & Western.....						
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.						
Burlington & Northwestern.....						
Burlington & Western.....						
Total.....		\$ 13,208,971.50		\$6,622,527.83	\$1,167,209.62	\$ 15,461,376.70

## ENTIRE LINE.

FROM OPERATIONS YR. ENDING JUNE 30, 1899.		FROM OPERATIONS YR. ENDING JUNE 30, 1898.		FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1899.		ON JUNE 30, 1899.	
Surplus.	Deficit.	Surplus.	Deficit.	Additions.	Deductions.	Surplus.	Deficit.
5,056,180.36		3,942,645.56			\$ 4,584,334.00	\$ 4,414,491.92	
342,986.38		2,557,752.30		\$ 53,536.78		2,954,275.46	
	\$ 1,026.25			1,026.25		1,026.25	
1,613,839.38		12,292,236.17				13,866,075.55	
58,811.21		61,909.83				120,530.54	
7,272.13		1,776,391.05				1,783,663.18	
913.14		910,573.20				911,486.34	
	43,132.52		\$ 179,065.87			221,106.63	\$ 91.76
1,509.92						1,509.92	
	6,227.73		6,227.73				
2,977,176.33		9,802,695.08				12,779,871.41	
1,145,930.72		1,154,530.01				2,300,460.73	
3,935,107.28		6,377,325.85			\$ 5,000,000.00	5,372,432.83	
1,952,076.73		3,874,881.46			420,173.00	4,506,785.19	
	11,520.01		1,912,719.23			1,924,239.24	
	6,929.94		21,984.73			28,914.67	
69,790.88			3,716.35			69,074.53	
274,625.12		169,950.43			2,786.06	441,819.49	
	2,731.97		183.92			2,915.89	
102,481.14		639,681.53			487,215.46	254,947.21	
	6,514.12	10,363.50				3,949.38	
401.00			439.40				38.40
5,703.73		32,282.28				37,986.01	
	2,084.19		677,910.81			679,996.00	
193,865.28		306,702.07				470,567.35	
	14,734.16		1,998.56			14,734.16	
	102,746.11					100,757.55	
	15,679.64		135,719.86			151,390.50	
	116.44		10,941.98			10,958.42	
	147,936.45		517,189.96			222,480.94	
	53,731.68		9,818.33			63,550.01	
116.01			128,935.28			128,249.27	
	35,358.85		598,308.41			633,667.26	
\$ 17,070,354.87	\$ 248,801.93	\$ 43,887,954.14	\$ 4,186,436.80	\$ 54,563.03	\$ 11,307,319.60	\$ 50,573,874.24	\$ 3,675,952.12

\*Cost of construction.



TABLE 16—

RAILROADS.	PASSENGER.				
	Originating and terminating in Iowa.	Originating but not terminating in Iowa.	Terminating but not originating in Iowa.	Crossing the state.	Total passenger revenue.
Ames & College	\$ 3,334.11				\$ 3,334.11
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	150.15				23,435.78
Boone Valley	575,395.35	\$ 86,916.72	\$ 143,403.75	\$ 90,400.81	150.15
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern	1,653.94				896,178.13
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern					1,653.94
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy					43,859.50
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City					55,459.83
Chicago, St. Joe & Council Bluffs					15,405.95
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern					6,828.60
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines					512,595.27
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota					1,462,078.26
Chicago Great Western					1,743,574.46
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul					1,986,759.78
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific					171,686.23
Chicago & North-Western	955,902.71	332,081.66	211,827.18	486,948.21	194,705.88
Chicago, St. Paul, Min'n'is & Omaha					702.01
Sioux City & Pacific	85,821.08	46,050.25	20,224.33	42,000.22	111,241.09
Crooked Creek					662,561.96
Des Moines, Northern & Western					531.63
Dubuque & Sioux City					289,673.50
Stacyville railroad					8,064.14
Des Moines Union					1,392.18
Iowa Central					132,941.96
Albia & Centerville					32,538.12
Iowa Northern					100,921.73
Keokuk & Western					1,444.84
Mason City & Ft. Dodge					76,784.14
Minneapolis & St. Louis					23,549.25
Muscatine, North & South					3,670.04
Omaha & St. Louis					53,030.10
Sioux City & Northern					5,453.86
Tabor & Northern	12,033.67	3,956.27	7,559.31		14,552.11
Union Pacific					15,256.48
Wabash					
Winona & Western					
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.					
Burlington & Northwestern					
Burlington & Western					
Total	\$1,634,292.51	\$ 469,604.92	\$ 383,024.57	\$ 619,409.24	\$8,651,799.67

EARNINGS—IOWA.

	EXPRESS.					Extra baggage and storage.	Mails.	Other items.	Total passenger earnings.
	Originating and terminating in Iowa.	Originating but not terminating in Iowa.	Terminating but not originating in Iowa.	Crossing the state.	Total express.				
	\$ 227.60				\$ 3,892.89	\$ 327.09	\$ 5,243.98	\$ 184.80	\$ 3,334.11
					227.60		171.00		33,074.74
	131.34				64,211.16		110,049.24		548.75
					131.34	22.66	19.22		1,070,438.53
					6,318.34		8,979.25		1,827.16
					5,050.76		12,753.70	51.30	39,141.60
					4,500.00	260.66	4,760.66		78,315.69
					359.43		1,310.12	554.80	25,481.73
					42,398.00	9,660.05	51,324.05		8,498.21
					168,436.80	32,560.25	221,639.30	54,963.50	618,915.37
					141,253.04	21,995.32	173,703.88		1,939,678.11
					124,455.61	43,430.81	368,085.87		2,080,534.70
					10,961.79	4,271.25	24,277.66	2,612.40	2,424,314.47
					6,986.76	3,823.09	24,003.44	191.42	211,109.36
					9,000.00	2,491.74	13,169.24		229,710.59
					58,440.00	21,097.09	92,558.54	939.79	135,961.54
					240.00	33.80	841.52		838,320.38
									1,146.95
					14,402.40	5,011.60	41,637.00	940.73	854,365.23
					360.00		1,164.00		9,726.80
									1,392.18
					1,240.66	1,089.82	4,367.43		132,941.96
					13,767.36	2,182.36	21,693.28	247.01	39,335.53
					194.78	18.38			198,841.71
					795.67	16,037.17			1,657.97
					939.84	419.46	6,531.24		97,624.90
					253.67	75.14	433.24		31,439.79
									4,432.69
					2,587.50		17,898.60	894.06	
					181.05		1,688.04	35.11	74,410.29
					918.00	160.60	3,722.62	83.77	19,497.10
					1,782.00	147.01	4,612.79	8.50	21,807.68
\$ 358.94					\$ 687,384.30	\$ 149,074.45	\$1,135,817.44	\$ 61,489.69	\$ 10,885,565.55



TABLE 17—EARNINGS—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	FREIGHT.					Stock yards.	Elevators.	Other items.	Total freight earnings.	Total passenger freight earnings.
	Originating and terminating in Iowa.	Originating but not terminating in Iowa.	Terminating but not originating in Iowa.	Crossing the state.	Total freight revenue.					
Ames & College.					\$ 1,379.00			\$ 465.67	\$ 1,844.76	\$ 5,178.87
Atholson, Topeka & Santa Fe.					84,427.38	\$130.06		173.02	84,730.46	117,805.20
Boone Valley.					11,093.63				11,093.63	11,642.38
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.	\$ 727,011.31	\$1,127,421.65	\$ 565,594.37	\$ 603,938.53	\$3,324,955.86				\$3,324,955.86	\$4,395,394.39
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.	6,159.10	6,334.89	2,165.80		14,659.79				14,659.79	16,486.95
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.									135,962.22	193,103.91
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.									109,484.82	182,500.41
Kansas City, St. Joe & Council Bluffs.										
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.										
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.					57,379.67				57,379.67	82,861.40
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.					25,616.82			754.15	26,370.97	34,869.18
Chicago Great Western.					2,398,576.25				2,398,576.25	2,914,491.62
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.					7,592,088.67				7,592,088.67	9,531,766.78
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.					4,389,114.29				4,389,114.29	6,469,618.99
Chicago & North-Western.	1,394,996.01	2,746,440.11	1,817,798.78	1,689,404.39	7,618,639.29			1,142.38	7,619,781.67	10,044,096.34
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.					569,310.78			249.41	569,460.17	780,680.10
Sioux City & Pacific.	92,165.70	68,236.42	41,543.26	15,305.14	217,250.52			1.43	217,251.95	446,962.54
Crooked Creek.					10,154.19				10,154.19	11,595.00
Des Moines Northern & Western.					381,311.85				381,311.85	517,373.39
Dubuque & Sioux City.					2,086,812.21			4.25	2,086,816.46	2,922,076.81
Stacyville railroad.					6,062.64				6,062.64	7,309.59
Des Moines Union.										
Iowa Central.					1,232,746.69				1,232,746.69	1,587,111.92
Albia & Centerville.					31,005.61				31,005.61	40,732.11
Iowa Northern.					14,267.21				14,267.21	15,659.39
Keokuk & Western.					265,883.93				265,883.93	398,825.80
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.					169,576.97				169,576.97	208,912.50
Minneapolis & St. Louis.					322,048.17			987.85	323,036.02	461,877.73
Muscatine North & South.					10,020.11				10,020.11	12,278.08
Omaha & St. Louis.					124,153.72				124,153.72	231,778.62
Sioux City & Northern.	44,403.40	88,806.82	71,045.45	17,761.36	222,017.03		\$ 1,176.00		223,193.03	254,632.82
Tabor & Northern.					8,761.03				8,761.03	13,193.72
Union Pacific.										
Wabash.					105,477.99				105,477.99	179,888.28
Winona & Western.					30,304.00				30,304.00	37,662.75
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.										
Burlington & Northwestern.					72,141.65				72,141.65	91,578.75
Burlington & Western.					79,432.38				79,432.38	101,240.06
Total.	\$2,264,735.52	\$2,037,239.89	\$2,799,137.66	\$1,296,409.42	\$31,377,169.49	\$130.06	\$ 1,176.00	\$ 3,778.36	\$31,625,700.95	\$42,311,266.50

TABLE 18—EARNINGS—IOWA.

	OTHER EARNINGS FROM OPERATION.								
RAILROADS.	Switching charges—balance.	Car mileage credit—balance.	Hire of equipment—balance.	Telegraph.	Rents from tracks, yards and terminals.	Rents not otherwise provided for.	All other service.	Total other earnings.	Total gross earnings from operation—Iowa.
Ames & College.	\$ 79.97		\$ 481.69	180.52		\$ 377.52	\$ 125.63	\$ 1,345.33	\$ 5,178.87
Atholson, Topeka & Santa Fe.									119,050.53
Boone Valley.					\$ 6,000.00			6,000.00	11,612.38
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.									4,401,394.39
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.									16,486.95
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.									\$5,397,682.00
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.									\$193,103.91
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.									\$182,800.41
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.									\$67,538.48
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.									82,861.40
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.									34,869.18
Chicago Great Western.					7,889.53	9,029.18	3,410.00	4,189.00	7,562.00
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.					3,736.29	18,356.81	14,661.92	17,518.71	9,549,285.49
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.					4,477.45	7,283.36	72.36	36,735.02	6,506,464.01
Chicago & North-Western.						692.56		11,813.17	10,035,909.51
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.						2,433.41	768.63	10,226.13	770,433.97
Sioux City & Pacific.	110,918.69	\$ 1,206.58	4,916.89					426,266.25	1,563.00
Crooked Creek.		3,258.29	73.00	1,425.24		1,139.34		5,949.87	523,223.26
Des Moines, Northern & Western.				109.78	23,135.51	3,293.60		26,539.89	2,948,616.73
Dubuque & Sioux City.						1.52		1.32	7,210.91
Stacyville railroad.									91,696.06
Des Moines Union.				1,133.87		60.00	398.25	1,592.12	1,588,674.04
Iowa Central.						81.59		81.59	40,813.70
Albia & Centerville.									15,659.39
Iowa Northern.									398,825.80
Keokuk & Western.						168.35		209,180.85	2,945,616.77
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.						412.00		7,319.21	15,241.66
Minneapolis & St. Louis.					3,120.00	6.00	3,787.24	6.00	221,778.62
Muscatine North & South.									12,423.09
Omaha & St. Louis.	2,095.50	4,090.07						961.41	7,066.98
Sioux City & Northern.					229.37				229.37
Tabor & Northern.									448,450.62
Union Pacific.									179,888.28
Wabash.			387.36		200.88			588.24	38,250.99
Winona & Western.									91,578.75
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.									
Burlington & Northwestern.									101,240.06
Burlington & Western.									
Total.	\$ 8,743.23	\$ 8,823.30	\$ 554.69	\$ 14,905.48	\$ 69,636.84	\$ 34,054.97	\$ 10,233.72	\$ 129,524.78	\$ 48,466,158.44

\*Estimated. †Debit.



TABLE 19—EARNINGS—ENTIRE LINE.

RAILROADS.	PASSENGER EARNINGS.							
	PASSENGER REVENUE.				Mails.	Express.	Extra baggage and storage.	Other items.
	Total.	Deduct ins of royalty men- ta- tickets etc.	Net re- v- nue.	Net re- v- nue.				
Ames & College	\$ 3,334.11		\$ 3,334.11	\$ 3,334.11				
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	5,533,574.65		5,532,040.45	5,532,040.45				
Boone Valley	150.15		150.15	150.15				
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern	958,492.37	\$ 24,615.96	933,876.41	933,876.41				
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N.W.	1,653.94		1,653.94	1,653.94				
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	7,625,497.84		7,025,497.84	7,025,497.84				
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City	83,238.95		83,238.95	83,238.95				
Kansas City, St. Joe & Council Bluffs	693,247.98		693,247.98	693,247.98				
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern	15,405.95		15,405.95	15,405.95				
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines	6,828.66		6,828.66	6,828.66				
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	1,037,980.36		1,037,980.36	1,037,980.36				
Chicago Great Western	6,778,921.20		6,778,921.20	6,778,921.20				
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	4,986,505.30		4,986,505.30	4,986,505.30				
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	8,627,243.74		8,202,934.87	8,202,934.87				
Chicago & North-Western	2,137,373.55		2,137,373.55	2,137,373.55				
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	223,436.21		223,436.21	223,436.21				
Sioux City & Pacific	702.01		702.01	702.01				
Crooked Creek	111,241.09		111,241.09	111,241.09				
Des Moines, Northern & Western	711,540.85		669,467.81	669,467.81				
Dubuque & Sioux City	560.76		560.76	560.76				
Stacyville railroad								
Des Moines Union	374,222.39		374,222.39	374,222.39				
Iowa Central	8,153.45		8,153.45	8,153.45				
Albia & Centerville	1,392.18		1,392.18	1,392.18				
Keokuk & Western	165,674.14		165,674.14	165,674.14				
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	32,638.12		32,638.12	32,638.12				
Minneapolis & St. Louis	500,535.68		500,535.68	500,535.68				
Muscatine North & South	1,460.44		1,460.44	1,460.44				
Omaha & St. Louis	169,333.87		169,333.87	169,333.87				
Sioux City & Northern	27,800.23		27,800.23	27,800.23				
Tabor & Northern	3,670.64		3,670.64	3,670.64				
Union Pacific	4,188,033.05		4,188,033.05	4,188,033.05				
Wabash	26,304.17		26,304.17	26,304.17				
Winona & Western	14,552.11		14,552.11	14,552.11				
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.	15,256.48		15,256.48	15,256.48				
Burlington & Northwestern								
Burlington & Western								
Total	\$ 44,545,766.92	\$ 791,578.36	\$ 44,044,431.09	\$ 44,044,431.09	\$ 863,832.66	\$ 884,748.32	\$ 84,771.06	\$ 41,999.86

TABLE 20—EARNINGS—ENTIRE LINE.

RAILROADS.	FREIGHT EARNINGS.							
	FREIGHT REVENUE.				Stockyards.	Elevators.	Other items.	Total freight earnings.
	Total freight receipts.	Over-charge to ship- pers.	Other repay- ments.	Total deduc- tions.				
Ames & College	\$ 1,379.09							
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	19,936,727.00	\$ 745,955.04		\$ 745,955.04				
Boone Valley	11,093.63							
Burlington, Cedar Rap. & Nor	3,637,699.75							
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N.W.	14,659.79							
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	22,726,132.15							
Chicago, Bur. & Kan. City	285,026.01							
Kansas City, St. Jo. & O. B.	1,327,088.75							
St. Louis, Keokuk & N.W.	57,379.67							
Chicago, Ft. M. & Des Moines	25,616.82							
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	4,475,406.15							
Chicago Great Western	28,773,222.43							
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. P.	14,299,529.46							
Chicago, Rock Island & Pac.	30,865,502.45							
Chicago & North-Western	1,967,971.68							
Chicago, St. Paul, Minn. & O	292,153.14							
Sioux City & Pacific	10,154.19							
Crooked Creek	381,311.85							
Des Moines Northern & West.	2,118,161.32							
Dubuque & Sioux City	6,070.61							
Stacyville railroad								
Des Moines Union	1,764,518.40							
Iowa Central	38,353.65							
Albia & Centerville	14,267.21							
Iowa Northern	347,354.93							
Keokuk & Western	169,576.97							
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	1,925,628.61							
Minneapolis & St. Louis	10,976.19							
Muscatine North & South	274,534.58							
Omaha & St. Louis	293,325.74							
Sioux City & Northern	8,775.00							
Tabor & Northern								
Union Pacific	10,060,938.65							
Wabash	147,009.71							
Winona & Western								
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.	72,141.65							
Burlington & Northwestern	79,432.38							
Burlington & Western								
Total	\$132,397,826.73	\$2,542,906.75	\$1,196,984.41	\$3,739,971.16	\$150,210,198.22	\$101,373.33	\$52,267.90	\$150,650,415.78



TABLE 21—EARNINGS FROM OPERATION—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	OTHER EARNINGS FROM OPERATION.							Total gross earnings from operation—entire line	Proportion of gross earnings from operation—Iowa.
	Switching charges—balance.	Car mileage—balance.	Hire of equipment—balance.	Telegraph companies.	Rents from tracks, yards and terminals.	Rents not otherwise provided for.	Other sources.		
Ames & College								\$ 5,178.87	\$ 5,178.87
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	\$ 18,174.59		\$ 106,474.46	\$ 41,028.37	\$ 65,987.88	\$ 85,801.15	\$ 28,532.29	\$ 340,018.84	\$ 26,804,331.57
Boone Valley					6,000.00			6,000.00	11,642.38
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern									11,642.38
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern									4,796,105.48
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	385,189.65				63,795.08	306,540.17	240,152.09	963,677.99	33,163,329.34
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City	151.00			1,450.83		1,30.93	2,568.76	5,429.52	416,354.28
Kansas City, St. Joseph & C. B.	881.90			4,964.37	72,101.44	25,238.11	775.86	103,934.68	2,343,339.87
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern	10,903.57			2,337.08	138,182.10	16,301.56	2,886.62	170,610.93	2,341,413.36
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines									82,861.40
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota					931.08		8,910.72	17,460.73	24,889.18
Chicago Great Western									5,854,336.78
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul				32,694.47		108,589.51		141,283.98	38,310,632.49
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific				7,472.59	158,178.61	92,651.19		258,322.39	29,647,216.48
Chicago & North-Western					32,681.43	58,291.93	14,632.17	105,605.53	39,051,653.19
Chicago, St. Paul, Minn. & Omaha	\$ 43,359.70				25,200.15	14,198.19		82,767.04	10,476,496.98
Sioux City & Pacific	2,131.53				14,620.53	2,666.41	884.16	20,302.92	531,261.63
Crooked Creek									11,565.00
Des Moines Northern & Western	3,358.39		73.00	1,435.24		1,193.34		5,949.87	523,223.28
Dubuque & Sioux City				109.78	38,136.51	3,293.60		39,539.89	2,970,459.56
Stacyville railroad						1.32		1.32	7,210.91
Des Moines Union									91,696.06
Iowa Central				1,289.67		60.00	471.91	1,821.58	2,120,575.11
Albia & Centerville						81.59		81.59	40,813.70
Iowa Northern									15,659.39
Keokuk & Western	16,844.59	2,119.57		1,071.24	11,800.00		2,636.58	34,471.98	586,508.67
Mason City & Ft. Dodge						168.35		168.35	209,080.85
Minneapolis & St. Louis	28,539.33	10,645.38	18,475.05		130,963.35		1,070.07	175,629.63	2,645,064.98
Muscatine North & South						6.00		6.00	12,281.08
Omaha & St. Louis									482,150.05
Sioux City & Northern	2,614.00	5,027.53				1,097.84	8,739.37	338,057.85	261,719.80
Tabor & Northern				229.37				229.37	13,423.09
Union Pacific									14,433.09
Wabash					64,779.34			64,779.34	14,458,753.49
Winona & Western	1,895.92			807.67			109.12	3,002.71	184,253.81
Burlington & Northwestern									91,578.75
Burlington & Western									101,240.06
Total	\$ 413,457.04	\$ 83,133.14	\$ 123,142.68	\$ 95,010.68	\$ 799,408.19	\$ 723,971.68	\$ 305,712.19	\$ 2,544,805.60	\$ 209,694,638.85

\*Train mileage basis. †Estimated.

TABLE 22—OPERATING EXPENSES—IOWA.

RAILROADS.	MAINTENANCE OF WAY AND STRUCTURES.										Total.
	Repairs of roadway.	Renewal of rails.	Renewal of ties.	Repairs and renewals of bridges and culverts.	Repairs and renewals of fences, road crossings, signs and cattle guards.	Repairs and renewals of buildings and fixtures.	Repairs and renewals of wharves.	Repairs and renewals of telegraph.	Stationery and printing.	Other expenses.	
Ames & College	\$ 121.84					6.75				13.80	\$ 143.30
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	10,856.78	261.00	2,231.86	3,184.01	248.29	1,779.87		181.64	9.27		18,725.72
Boone Valley											1,047,648.15
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Nor.						158.28					2,829.97
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N-W	2,665.69										
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy											
Chicago, Burlington & Kan. C'y											
Kansas City, St. Joseph & C. B.											
St. Louis, Keokuk & North-W											
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines	15,147.47	133.47	9,562.60	1,632.17	470.18	302.59				2,696.29	30,004.81
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	8,217.32		1,230.04	680.97	356.58	272.93					5,768.04
Chicago Great Western	210,176.76	14,635.30	68,181.53	70,248.42	7,322.73	22,119.31					363,697.72
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	677,518.04	156,895.94	206,900.15	267,431.16	63,762.12	141,914.57		11,230.35	270.95	581,927.50	2,107,241.74
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	448,303.60	18,745.85	106,553.62	106,802.99	33,692.71	163,359.63		7,451.02	1,156.65		830,561.55
Chicago & North-Western	598,875.09	68,931.59	105,374.29	109,067.90	39,606.54	123,133.82	15,509.83	4,581.13	4,696.07		1,087,625.27
Chicago, St. Paul, Minn. & Omaha	67,292.48	4,814.43	11,932.30	20,426.14	1,892.19	11,097.47	581.61	1,060.68	47.35		119,174.65
Sioux City & Pacific	16,428.42	2.00	5,251.27	1,933.47	692.46	4,046.63		731.02	201.44		30,492.60
Crooked Creek	2,548.23	985.00	186.75	500.62	492.24	81.76					85,916.47
Des Moines Northern & Western	64,642.71	2,813.67	8,107.82	4,286.09	212.28	5,474.08					417,609.20
Dubuque & Sioux City	205,846.10	40,633.24	41,556.01	67,420.37	16,144.43	40,556.03		3,348.71	810.94	1,403.37	1,284.04
Stacyville railroad	1,168.55			41.77		603.95					16,141.44
Des Moines Union	9,974.58	1,086.57	2,589.61					2,193.33	373.24		295,319.49
Iowa Central	143,946.28	4,989.90	74,762.89	45,305.61	1,976.64	21,781.01		3.56			14,785.13
Albia & Centerville	6,478.68		5,756.20	1,892.14	223.47	490.08					3,494.37
Iowa Northern	4,170.36	1,112.21	435.69								74,594.92
Keokuk & Western	35,860.50	221.52	14,665.38	8,057.59	6,893.72	6,878.08		863.96			49,050.22
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	209,692.45	261.38	3,081.48	22,575.19	1,131.60	1,398.12		806.93	278.06		69,426.30
Minneapolis & St. Louis	45,326.74	8,379.95	5,916.87	18,658.52	2,942.96	7,566.37		9.52	48.50		2,099.84
Muscatine North & South	1,426.29			261.17	109.30			383.37			52,936.44
Omaha & St. Louis	25,939.04		5,300.17	5,616.28	688.34	5,303.37		314.00		1,914.15	39,735.37
Sioux City & Northern	17,599.08				70.63						3,919.47
Tabor & Northern	73.51	673.61	1,829.43	1,017.46							
Union Pacific											
Wabash	38,275.44	10,081.86	14,881.95	14,151.03	932.62	4,190.48		205.13	62.25	2,519.10	85,480.76
Winona & Western	4,921.67		2,784.55	1,520.38	87.95	490.88		150.67	2.32		9,928.32
Burlington & Northwestern	7,482.80	10.65	1,383.60	835.30	499.13	4,122.05		166.09	5.97		14,505.52
Burlington & Western	14,269.54	4,771.67	2,307.29	6,404.88	562.62	2,696.30		47.19	6.50		31,066.38
Total	\$ 2,698,971.90	\$ 200,696.60	\$ 704,817.73	\$ 768,940.36	\$ 182,089.84	\$ 583,241.64	\$ 16,091.44	\$ 37,505.27	\$ 11,730.23	\$ 995,000.04	\$ 6,994,679.99

\*Credit.



TABLE 23—OPERATING EXPENSES—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT.									Total.
	Superintendence.	Repairs and renewals of locomotives.	Repairs and renewals of passenger cars.	Repairs and renewals of freight cars.	Repairs and renewals of work cars.	Repairs and renewals of machinery equipment.	Repairs and renewals of shop machinery and tools.	Stationery and printing.	Other expenses.	
Ames & College.		\$ 116.86	\$ 242.03	\$ 342.93				\$ 7.50	\$ 178.33	\$ 887.70
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.	\$ 178.93	5,632.57	1,167.72	5,713.85	339.52		380.82	16.48		13,429.89
Boone Valley.										585,555.52
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.		75.73		59.47					89.76	224.96
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.										
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.										
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.										
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.										
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.										
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.	300.00	2,849.25	620.57	1,035.65			74.61			4,879.79
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.		1,542.88	59.84	8.75			24.87			1,636.14
Chicago Great Western.	3,103.80	126,128.64	32,358.79	105,748.54			6,201.79	2,843.82	7,775.83	284,167.71
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	63,446.46	314,787.08	135,601.04	407,264.73	9,162.58		23,061.92	3,110.68	19,923.75	976,338.14
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	14,670.34	210,385.62	69,834.16	285,623.01	7,425.79		18,775.71	2,863.93	28,906.35	638,504.91
Chicago & North-Western.	62,469.98	433,875.28	127,989.24	470,866.62	24,203.59	\$58.30	25,470.66	6,240.68	32,001.13	1,183,175.48
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.	4,241.78	31,257.13	15,573.31	30,795.69	1,671.48		3,209.77	48.02	1,927.43	88,734.61
Sioux City & Pacific.	4,684.07	4,946.31	3,452.08	7,300.69	319.38		4,538.26	321.93		26,574.48
Crooked Creek.		1,267.07	1,171.57							2,438.64
Des Moines Northern & Western.		16,652.60	6,501.79	10,507.02	242.48		25.25	118.70		34,047.84
Dubuque & Sioux City.	7,672.50	111,175.54	26,809.42	91,217.64	3,357.89		8,822.22	735.96	5,011.99	254,803.16
Stacyville railroad.	59.12	493.98		9.36	42.67		108.27	6.91	63.42	783.73
Des Moines Union.	2,000.00	2,404.68		232.77			3,380.16		962.00	8,979.61
Iowa Central.	11,365.26	50,941.44	17,298.66	57,866.31	2,029.22		5,659.31	336.63	3,702.40	149,199.23
Albia & Centerville.		1,512.34	401.55	1,558.11						3,472.00
*Iowa Northern.										
Keokuk & Western.	1,224.00	13,540.60	4,277.61	26,458.19	451.85		22.56	100.98	848.20	46,923.99
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.		6,402.49	2,931.92	5,174.42			989.52			15,498.35
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	1,502.93	22,539.75	8,676.27	16,593.98	618.93		4,242.59	211.01	539.63	54,925.09
Muscatine North & South.		394.50	47.29	72.24				1.67		515.70
Omaha & St. Louis.	858.75	9,526.12	3,251.80	3,282.84	529.27		619.98	52.04	1,243.53	19,364.33
Sioux City & Northern.		8,599.20	1,824.60	19,172.97			976.45			30,573.22
Tabor & Northern.		32.72	78.08	70.71	.21					181.72
Union Pacific.										
Wabash.	1,639.71	12,547.88	3,093.58	3,760.98	116.67		1,384.74	60.87	2,113.56	25,317.97
Winona & Western.	348.77	1,017.18	301.91	1,141.61			51.18	7.30		2,867.95
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.										
Burlington & Northwestern.	339.00	1,508.36	375.92	1,599.67	62.97		56.19	2.41	80.32	4,024.84
Burlington & Western.	861.00	5,742.31	572.08	3,311.15	58.90		154.78	2.41	141.49	10,844.12
Total.	\$180,968.40	\$1,397,876.09	\$465,113.18	\$1,556,849.41	\$50,633.40	\$58.30	\$108,231.31	\$17,117.83	\$106,457.38	\$4,468,860.82

\* Equipment rented.

TABLE 24—OPERATING EXPENSES—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	CONDUCTING TRANSPORTATION.									
	Superintendence.	Engine and roundhouse men.	Fuel for locomotives.	Water supply for locomotives.	O. I. L. tallow and waste for locomotives.	Other supplies for locomotives.	Train service.	Train supplies and expenses.	Switchmen, watchmen, and flagmen.	Telegraph expenses.
Ames & College.	\$ 240.00	\$ 474.60	\$ 664.76	\$ 72.00	\$ 70.00		\$ 565.00		\$ 480.00	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.	1,180.69	8,214.14	6,203.97	567.23	213.54	105.18	5,850.77	1,394.98	2,312.28	1,762.95
Boone Valley.										
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Nor.										
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N. W.	1,987.58	1,480.94					1,331.25			
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.										
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.										
Kansas City, St. Jo & O. B.										
St. Louis, Keokuk & N. W.										
Chicago, Ft. Mad. & Des Moines.	600.00	5,186.22	5,364.38	550.17	136.06	72.21	4,842.94	2,143.71	81.12	1,056.34
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.		2,386.42	2,380.21	8.30	229.38	49.74	1,681.30	14.98		
Chicago Great Western.	12,423.20	126,136.86	235,902.04	13,584.81	9,222.80		137,137.34	22,857.28	51,724.80	45,206.17
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	115,430.48	688,736.85	702,144.36	2,720.48	18,758.18	7,607.58	546,908.51	66,821.37	227,627.80	157,680.94
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	70,218.88	397,115.21	340,705.02	24,103.42	9,695.61	5,984.68	305,152.93	74,693.97	100,066.34	84,243.58
Chicago & Northwestern.	36,319.60	656,564.96	577,517.46	28,665.30	20,722.39	8,997.37	473,696.84	78,064.07	222,865.79	125,428.11
Chicago, St. Paul, Minn. & O.	7,190.71	38,731.87	46,160.60	2,056.39	1,339.02	624.25	28,743.43	5,026.55	10,391.08	7,932.21
Sioux City & Pacific.	1,346.41	29,817.25	38,165.14	1,258.51	1,086.03	52.36	20,511.63	5,076.64	9,593.83	4,789.01
Crooked Creek.		3,043.31	2,219.40	60.31						
Des Moines Northern & Western.	7,624.68	20,105.43	23,077.32	2,998.05	768.54	84.29	14,735.19	909.13		6,004.22
Dubuque & Sioux City.	49,504.92	185,792.79	113,777.92	10,037.93	6,073.54	3,676.83	141,494.36	31,913.61	35,071.3	31,256.53
Stacyville railroad.	112.38	1,549.17	707.34	8.27	39.32	33.18	654.60	64.68		248.55
Des Moines Union.	920.00	11,005.20	3,628.35	1,560.10	1,971.71		5,507.09	250.00	13,876.00	
Iowa Central.	23,243.18	125,414.95	108,409.54	7,599.65	4,539.91	2,295.88	79,879.11	9,290.96	22,625.82	25,347.51
Albia & Centerville.		3,147.60	2,881.33	448.30	374.57	28.10	2,591.75	74.39		725.33
Iowa Northern.			1,815.05		100.05		3,096.00			
Keokuk & Western.	6,732.00	25,458.31	21,230.18	2,164.80	1,211.89	534.88	18,862.05	2,311.97	3,242.19	7,816.33
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.		8,077.27	10,696.82		911.53		4,918.51	274.75		2,261.78
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	784.40	33,555.40	39,740.77	2,262.88	1,216.98	404.01	21,311.77	4,611.98	4,914.39	7,646.38
Muscatine North & South.	713.83	2,361.60	1,182.58	213.02	66.25	15.58	1,617.58	72.84		513.47
Omaha & St. Louis.	5,138.94	24,857.77	28,741.38	1,791.23	942.33	519.97	14,766.61	4,805.91	3,547.59	3,054.23
Sioux City & Northern.		2,087.09	11,493.15	16,900.53		654.59	6,146.39	1,791.59	4,230.23	3,348.89
Tabor & Northern.		1,263.98	672.18		81.53	17.58	401.15	2.00		57.63
Union Pacific.										
Wabash.	5,711.91	18,064.77	11,932.50	1,105.56	629.43	212.19	10,740.36	648.24	4,917.51	6,097.02
Winona & Western.	809.64	2,245.29	3,099.21	17.65	146.01	14.78	1,438.32	248.35	199.80	220.68
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.										
Burlington & Northwestern.	1,298.00	3,924.87	2,149.55	312.69	82.16	56.36	2,002.52	671.60	543.57	846.66
Burlington & Western.	1,550.13	9,469.07	8,521.09	1,140.39	294.73	99.61	7,485.84	1,314.65	1,331.18	1,014.22
Total.	\$ 351,059.54	\$ 2,505,771.19	\$ 2,351,185.99	\$ 142,119.50	\$ 78,827.78	\$ 32,141.10	\$ 1,862,921.14	\$ 314,816.20	\$ 719,581.12	\$ 524,558.77



TABLE 25—OPERATING EXPENSES—IOWA—CONTINUED.

162

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE

RAILROADS.	CONDUCTING TRANSPORTATION—CONTINUED.									
	Station serv- ice.	Station sup- plies.	Switching charges— balance.	Car mileage— balance.	Hire of equip- ment.	Loss and dam- age.	Injuries to persons.	Clearing wrecks.	Operat'g ma- rine equip- ment.	Advertising.
Ames & College										
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	\$ 4,214.69	\$ 438.29		\$ 1,900.95		\$ 683.31	\$ 692.69	\$ 75.03		\$ 288.69
Boone Valley										
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern										
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern	892.00	277.00		157.31	105.00	51.14				
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy										
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City										
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs										
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern										
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines	6,038.60	267.28	940.15	1,116.56	136.05	98.40	542.50	49.15		54.25
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	2,652.89	309.17	100.88	14.21			650.82			
Chicago Great Western	157,546.10	12,729.54	50,545.04	49,068.98	302.28	19,247.56	25,211.06	4,656.70		18,392.60
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	428,434.63	48,314.77	81,963.90	63,381.83		36,721.05	49,926.62	5,054.76		18,563.25
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	179,578.54	18,049.10		54,917.03		20,912.50	6,168.78			25,998.68
Chicago & North-Western	387,595.63	35,736.62	45,770.93	46,241.12	1,469.84	35,727.18	81,185.75	6,263.47	\$ 805.57	24,957.30
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	25,429.87	2,791.68	290.23			1,983.80	2,671.87	323.04		593.00
Sioux City & Pacific	22,040.71	2,532.10	5,257.11		11,195.82	1,319.36	7,591.18	86.65		582.27
Crooked Creek	811.35					55.32				
Des Moines, Northern & Western	15,688.84	1,217.39	2,518.00			1,376.78	1,595.99	41.49		424.33
Dubuque & Sioux City	95,569.29	10,958.62	4,619.40	51,000.13		9,410.71	16,737.57	1,139.45		4,655.73
Stacyville railroad	887.05	39.19				8.11	29.50	6.60		
Des Moines Union	17,486.51	5,166.00					248.30			
Iowa Central	44,331.06	4,814.16	7,520.11	35,794.19	*1,653.49	8,773.45	4,495.43	3,581.84		4,356.90
Albia & Centerville	1,601.61	79.95	*16.00	1,322.63		789.08	76.00	271.88		
Iowa Northern					1,326.10	24.00				
Keokuk & Western	17,316.44	643.26	1,922.08			645.56	435.27	9.79		316.04
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	5,229.72	460.60		624.80		939.69	610.14	283.00		39.50
Minneapolis & St. Louis	13,577.34	1,167.13		*3,341.48	*4,989.10	1,193.34	1,112.35	78.85		910.51
Muscatine North & South	1,597.29	197.61	528.61	364.22		205.37	6.50	170.77		49.50
Omaha & St. Louis	12,040.72	817.70	828.92	8,202.74	4,467.10	2,511.34	1,161.38	1,205.63		282.84
Sioux City & Northern	11,736.19	1,237.41				253.38	2,024.38	67.19		78.17
Tabor & Northern	626.95	9.17		85.57		12.90	131.56	1.50		6.50
Union Pacific										
Wabash	37,698.75	1,707.45		6,988.08		4,045.32	903.69			
Winona & Western	2,361.68	229.69	384.84		13.70	17.31	26.62	1.96		11.78
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.										
Burlington & Northwestern	4,875.77	302.17	37.90	119.66		173.36	94.80	20.29		132.14
Burlington & Western	7,864.34	297.52	933.26	246.26		205.20	49.35	34.01		125.42
Total	\$1,505,633.96	\$ 150,808.57	\$ 204,245.15	\$ 318,205.79	\$ 12,373.30	\$ 148,485.52	\$ 264,390.04	\$ 22,424.10	\$ 805.57	\$ 100,814.40

\*Credit.

TABLE 26—OPERATING EXPENSES—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	CONDUCTING TRANSPORTATION—CONTINUED.							
	Outside agencies.	Commissions.	Stock yards and elevators.	Rents for tracks, yards and terminals.	Rents of buildings and other property.	Stationery and print- ing.	Other ex- penses.	Total.
Ames & College								\$ 2,566.35
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	\$ 1,335.49	\$ 250.80		\$ 621.86	\$ 97.04	\$ 361.64	\$ 498.09	\$ 3,091.75
Boone Valley								
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern								1,199,198.60
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern						551.59		6,743.81
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy								
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City								
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs								
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern								
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines	2,251.69	16.95		2,332.25	216.00	2,943.34		36,038.32
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota			\$ 233.14				509.74	11,226.18
Chicago Great Western	77,585.64		5,265.04	35,415.83		10,988.31	22,272.69	1,213,432.16
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	94,299.57		13,731.48	63,070.51	23,508.29	40,270.25	16,933.65	3,537,612.91
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	115,973.95			24,812.32	13,973.97	27,436.47	27,188.46	1,986,922.42
Chicago & North-Western	88,581.30	91,545.31		19,577.42	3,496.05	30,784.92		3,127,560.30
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	5,963.77	918.08	5,497.93	7,954.11	415.31	2,933.44		205,967.24
Sioux City & Pacific	5,088.82	2,240.54			740.87	2,346.57		172,248.31
Crooked Creek							276.68	6,466.37
Des Moines Northern & Western	2,265.11	191.13		69,133.77	1,555.01	1,658.69	719.17	174,692.58
Dubuque & Sioux City	45,881.28	3,724.36		6,321.03		18,406.11	1,454.55	878,479.96
Stacyville railroad						89.04	1.45	4,458.43
Des Moines Union								59,777.26
Iowa Central	9,843.80	3,565.00	71.56	24,674.00	1,886.11	9,211.37	1,983.03	571,925.06
Albia & Centerville					60.00			14,456.52
Iowa Northern					190.00		166.83	6,708.03
Keokuk & Western	1,016.50			680.00	2,333.15	1,098.75	1,882.19	117,863.63
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	15.98							36,091.11
Minneapolis & St. Louis	6,278.41	1,370.91			952.75	3,195.13		137,775.10
Muscatine North & South	114.41				6.88	198.12	99.15	10,284.18
Omaha & St. Louis	6,348.45	618.14		8,037.09	2,705.13	1,110.05	651.08	138,654.27
Sioux City & Northern	804.97			4,809.60				67,665.75
Tabor & Northern			2.93	5.00		33.70	53.27	3,465.04
Union Pacific								
Wabash					317.88	1,980.00	* 16,601.76	98,034.60
Winona & Western	51.88		11.84	542.26		159.45		12,255.24
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.								
Burlington & Northwestern	731.04			6,720.43	386.84	43.40		25,526.08
Burlington & Western	817.89			800.07		641.34	44.80	44,250.37
Total	\$465,257.95	\$104,441.22	\$23,818.92	\$275,507.55	\$52,831.31	\$156,421.68	\$58,133.07	\$13,939,178.23

\* Credit.

BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS.

163



TABLE 27—OPERATING EXPENSES—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	GENERAL EXPENSES.						
	Salaries of general of-ficers.	Salaries of clerks and attendants.	General office expenses and sup-plies.	Insurance.	Law expenses.	Stationery and printing (general offices).	Other expenses.
Ames & College.....	\$ 395.30	\$ 963.43	\$ 438.83	\$ 70.50	\$ 600.63	\$ 191.60	\$ 60.47
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....				187.10		104.58	45.14
Boone Valley.....							
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....							
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	2,051.17		541.19		178.00		
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....							
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....							
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.....							
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....	5,370.24	1,214.49	120.51	814.79	1,943.00		2,513.81
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	1,345.00	513.32	533.58	130.00		270.41	306.50
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	40,164.13	48,535.77	14,430.05	5,550.00	20,509.86	2,843.82	21,528.91
Chicago Great Western.....	72,922.23	68,184.04	13,774.41	29,113.48	20,939.43	5,028.16	60,188.88
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....		107,463.84	5,777.72	314.06	25,379.83	9,619.29	80,137.31
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....		76,467.18	20,418.97	538.05	38,678.12	4,986.30	3,056.64
Chicago & North-Western.....	38,576.90	4,371.79	827.03	653.27	998.37	494.14	1,704.81
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	3,387.65	5,813.11	724.65	1.98	1,169.69	176.49	2.44
Sioux City & Pacific.....	3,080.00						884.89
Crooked Creek.....	8,250.00	2,484.40	23,056.99	181.99	745.35	209.12	1,632.62
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....	16,859.28	22,264.20	7,400.89	11,694.71	2,689.68	7,117.33	7,117.33
Dubuque & Sioux City.....							
Stacyville railroad.....		1,350.00	808.00	435.05		213.00	
Des Moines Union.....	17,605.23	14,933.52	3,040.46	1,368.00	773.61	2,468.03	5,702.09
Iowa Central.....		60.00		16.03	443.97	67.65	8.94
Albia & Centerville.....	600.00	580.00		475.66			1,655.66
Iowa Northern.....	8,183.67	6,214.56	394.99	749.71	2,825.29	505.45	5,835.76
Keokuk & Western.....	5,882.50	2,324.00	6,677.88	547.11	459.73	1,339.24	7,223.48
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	17,917.30	11,189.44	1,150.03	1,265.03	3,458.88		4,937.74
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	210.00	594.35	917.61	19.25		134.18	77.23
Muscatine North & South.....	2,160.60	2,453.27	812.82	716.71	593.33	512.19	213.91
Omaha & St. Louis.....	7,925.38	6,343.70	229.08	1,263.72	967.93	2,554.50	393.03
Sioux City & Northern.....	243.67		32.46	32.00	52.60	48.35	6.10
Tabor & Northern.....							
Union Pacific.....	630.34	561.31		800.68	878.58	283.26	792.27
Wabash.....	249.12	99.65	232.38	90.91	2.08	79.72	113.14
Winona & Western.....							
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.							
Burlington & North-Western.....	2,117.76	1,270.07	220.95	325.20	25	184.42	
Burlington & Western.....	2,502.24	1,663.73	243.08	384.30	60.19	170.89	
Total.....	\$ 263,763.15	\$ 382,491.57	\$ 102,409.64	\$ 56,531.63	\$ 131,696.96	\$ 35,562.56	\$ 196,659.95

TABLE 28—OPERATING EXPENSES—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	RECAPITULATION OF EXPENSES.					Grand total.	Percentage of total earnings Iowa.
	Maintenance of way and structures.	Maintenance of equip-ment.	Conducting transpor-tation.	General ex-penses.			
Ames & College.....	\$ 18,725.72	\$ 13,429.89	\$ 39,191.75	\$ 2,865.00		\$ 3,919.01	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....						74,212.36	62.31
Boone Valley.....						6,675.27	
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	1,047,608.28	585,555.52	1,196,198.60	110,024.96		2,943,427.33	66.900
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	2,823.97	224.96	5,743.81	3,365.36		15,161.10	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....						*4,250,419.00	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....						*125,722.02	
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....						*182,778.94	
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....						*61,932.75	
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	30,004.81	4,879.79	36,038.32	11,476.84		82,399.76	99.89
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	5,758.94	1,636.14	11,226.18	3,118.71		21,739.97	
Chicago Great Western.....	363,697.72	284,167.71	1,213,431.16	163,567.54		2,014,864.13	68.95
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	2,107,241.74	976,338.14	3,537,612.91	294,194.68		6,885,387.47	773.11
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	638,564.55	1,886,922.42	228,625.37	3,091,617.25		5,576,113.21	55.55
Chicago & North-Western.....	1,087,625.27	1,183,175.48	3,127,590.30	177,722.16		5,576,113.21	55.55
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	119,174.65	88,724.61	206,967.24	14,263.80		428,150.30	55.57
Sioux City & Pacific.....	172,486.90	26,574.84	172,486.91	11,276.01		342,834.66	55.57
Crooked Creek.....	4,463.60	3,496.94	6,496.37	3,964.89		15,421.80	55.57
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....	85,916.47	34,047.84	174,692.58	26,540.47		331,197.36	63.80
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	417,609.20	254,803.16	878,479.96	79,820.03		1,630,412.35	55.29
Stacyville railroad.....	1,284.04	783.73	4,458.43	2.95		6,529.15	90.50
Des Moines Union.....	16,141.44	8,979.61	59,777.26	6,798.75		91,697.06	
Iowa Central.....	285,339.49	149,190.23	571,925.06	45,980.94		1,052,455.73	66.24
Albia & Centerville.....	14,785.13	3,472.00		1,186.59		33,850.24	82.93
Iowa Northern.....	3,494.37		6,705.18	1,855.06		11,054.61	
Keokuk & Western.....	74,894.62	46,323.62	117,863.63	23,021.97		262,003.84	65.95
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	49,030.23	15,498.35	36,091.11	17,283.48		117,863.16	56.372
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	89,428.30	54,625.09	137,775.10	40,685.71		322,812.20	68.80
Muscatine North & South.....						14,425.93	117.49
Omaha & St. Louis.....	52,936.84	19,364.33	188,654.27	7,462.83		218,418.27	98.4
Sioux City & Northern.....	36,735.37	30,573.22	67,665.75	19,676.94		157,651.28	61.913
Tabor & Northern.....	3,949.47	181.72	3,465.04	415.18		8,011.41	59.68
Union Pacific.....							
Wabash.....	85,480.78	25,317.87	96,034.62	8,449.22		212,282.91	118.01
Winona & Western.....	9,928.32	2,897.94	12,253.24	866.99		35,918.49	67.75
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.							
Burlington & North-Western.....	14,505.52	4,024.84	25,526.08	4,118.65		48,175.09	52.50
Burlington & Western.....	31,166.38	10,944.12	44,990.37	4,904.05		91,194.92	89.90
Total.....	\$ 6,932,537.76	\$ 4,467,457.41	\$ 13,934,746.70	\$ 1,276,552.25		\$ 31,479,771.68	

\* Estimated. † Excluding taxes.



TABLE 29—OPERATING EXPENSES—ENTIRE LINE.

RAILROADS.	MAINTENANCE OF WAY AND STRUCTURES.										Total.
	Repairs of roadway.	Renewals of rails.	Renewals of ties.	Repairs and renewals of bridges and culverts.	Repairs and renewals of fences, crossings and cattle guards.	Repairs and renewals of buildings and fixtures.	Repairs and renewals of depots and wharves.	Repairs and renewals of telegraph.	Stationery and printing.	Other expenses.	
Ames & College	\$ 121.84					6.75				13.80	142.39
Atchison, T. & S. P.	2,467,450.85	60,000.00	504,968.28	719,002.78	56,430.37	401,425.90	90.38	41,380.86	2,106.33		4,265,845.75
Boone Valley	538,241.17	62,259.14	162,475.98	214,019.37	27,009.98	134,197.68					1,145,704.23
Cedar Rap. & N.W.	2,665.69					158.28					2,823.97
Chicago, Burl'g'n & Q.	2,195,579.96	401,305.91	616,573.05	667,238.52	117,571.93	678,291.02	20,838.02	47,309.25	989.25	*998.12	4,742,748.79
Chicago, Bur. & K. O.	36,079.28	5,795.80	23,295.90	30,933.75	5,493.59	6,250.76		531.87	17.78		111,398.82
K. O. St. J. & O. B.	212,621.46	49,550.01	42,897.92	57,138.92	7,083.27	28,645.82		2,142.58	162.93	379.00	400,626.93
St. Louis, K. & N.W.	235,924.63	25,651.86	34,496.76	59,913.19	7,832.43	20,157.09		2,808.70	92.87		395,577.53
Chicago, Ft. M. & D. M.	15,147.51	133.47	5,653.69	1,632.17	470.18	382.59				2,696.29	20,004.81
Chicago, Iowa & Dak.	3,217.52		1,230.04	689.97	356.88	272.93					5,758.04
Chicago Great West'n	430,353.54	22,270.61	138,263.06	60,496.84	14,645.45	44,238.74		7,680.45	7,325.54	7,021.15	727,395.38
Chicago, Mil. & St. P.	2,241,210.84	519,007.29	684,419.96	884,654.86	210,928.65	467,464.67		37,116.58	896.29	1,925,000.00	6,970,697.14
Chicago, R. I. & Pac.	1,080,000.50	164,209.25	519,849.12	350,283.07	88,933.70	463,831.49		27,493.75	3,861.96	68.57	3,308,561.41
Chicago & North-W.	2,611,626.93	300,602.72	459,525.13	527,353.86	172,719.57	563,089.73	67,636.56	19,977.80	20,479.01		4,743,008.31
Chic. St. P. M. & O.	962,514.40	71,451.73	175,922.63	301,270.53	37,208.11	163,679.56	5,575.30	15,044.23	698.43		1,737,738.21
St. Louis & Pacific	21,430.42	307.85	7,609.96	2,607.70	925.37	6,003.90		977.04	268.91		40,629.05
Crooked Creek.	2,546.23	655.00	138.75	500.62	492.24	81.76					4,492.60
Des Moines, N. & W.	61,642.71	2,813.67	8,107.82	4,286.09	212.28	5,474.03		358.99	21.48		85,916.47
Dubuque & Sioux City.	211,657.19	40,645.85	44,141.67	69,657.12	16,701.97	41,809.46		3,325.91	836.20	1,438.03	430,133.40
Stacyville railroad.	1,168.55			41.77					9.46	2.30	1,184.04
Des Moines Union.	9,974.58	1,086.57	2,580.61			1,888.73					16,141.44
Iowa Central.	230,193.49	42,833.73	97,038.43	60,676.07	13,306.09	26,188.25		2,788.98	453.13		473,480.21
Albia & Centerville.	6,479.68		6,756.20	1,892.14	233.47	430.08			3.56		14,785.13
Iowa Northern.	4,170.89	*1,112.31	435.09								5,494.37
Keokuk & Western.	325,708.63	325.77	21,566.74	11,849.39	101.03	10,114.82		1,402.88	108.50	1,468.04	102,098.42
Mason City & Ft. D.	20,692.45	261.38	3,081.48	23,578.19	1,131.60	1,308.12					49,050.22
Minneapolis & St. L.	225,894.35	96,538.30	50,834.93	30,045.26	10,693.92	44,414.23		1,399.23	835.04		460,655.26
Muscatine N. & S.	1,426.26			284.17	109.30	243.09		9.52	48.50		2,099.84
Omaha & St. Louis.	56,432.67	*4,594.13	18,553.04	30,577.12	1,116.81	12,161.15		833.43			115,080.09
St. Louis & Northern.	21,284.94		6,411.99	10,748.85	385.71	6,615.98		391.73		2,887.89	49,570.08
Tabor & Northern.	778.31	673.64	1,329.43	1,017.46	70.63	79.80					3,949.47
Union Pacific.	970,528.59	34,690.14	272,210.69	198,302.16	59,044.35	213,720.56	9,092.57	33,391.15	1,612.17	113,598.17	1,896,190.55
Winona & Western.	33,707.48		13,413.06	7,323.14	279.12	2,364.55		725.75	11.17		47,824.27
NARROW GAUGE ROADS											
Burlington & N. W. H'n.	7,482.80	10.68	1,383.60	835.20	499.13	4,122.05		166.09	5.97		14,505.62
Burlington & Western.	14,269.54	4,771.67	2,307.39	6,404.88	692.62	2,666.80		47.19	6.89		31,066.38
Total	\$15,614,436.08	\$1,909,175.94	\$3,928,208.78	\$1,334,370.16	\$854,414.09	\$3,362,473.80	\$106,225.63	\$245,051.90	\$41,141.01	\$2,053,122.52	\$32,448,619.11

\* Credit.

TABLE 30—OPERATING EXPENSES—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT.										Total.
	Superintendent.	Repairs and renewals of locomotives.	Repairs and renewals of passenger cars.	Repairs and renewals of freight cars.	Repairs and renewals of work cars.	Repairs and renewals of marine equipment.	Repairs and renewals of machinery and tools.	Stationery and printing.	Other expenses.		
Ames & College		\$ 116.86	\$ 242.08	\$ 342.93			\$ 7.50	\$ 178.33	\$ 887.70		
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	\$ 40,665.00	1,280,129.43	265,390.92	1,308,603.02	77,161.15		3,746.75		3,052,248.48		
Boone Valley	27,356.55	123,562.25	55,764.70	114,942.60	4,200.22	\$250,000.00	11,392.55	566.53	640,329.96		
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern		75.73		59.47					234.56		
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern	170,633.10	1,467,538.45	365,536.30	1,346,191.84	39,019.09		148,603.72	5,588.88	3,677,978.17		
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	1,885.98	7,783.93	2,705.41	25,480.25	244.11		10,689.89	200.97	38,312.18		
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City	7,411.30	65,993.86	31,925.23	47,949.42	2,443.32		5,273.08	123.63	173,371.35		
Kansas City, St. Joseph & O. B.	9,033.74	46,556.33	19,606.00	142,160.85	2,492.31		74.51		231,450.64		
St. Louis Keokuk & Northwestern	300.00	2,549.25	620.87	1,035.16			74.51		4,579.79		
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines		1,542.88	59.81	8.71			24.67		1,636.14		
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	6,311.61	252,237.27	64,717.58	211,497.08			12,403.95	5,697.64	568,335.42		
Chicago Great Western	20,579.13	1,041,340.74	448,564.48	1,317,220.41	30,309.56		76,288.20	10,299.71	3,320,699.43		
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	45,943.34	658,634.82	225,597.35	888,191.43	25,093.96		58,930.64	9,099.11	2,011,498.71		
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	272,424.37	1,892,080.01	558,463.30	2,053,295.01	105,549.05	254.23	111,074.61	27,214.91	5,159,691.72		
Chicago & North-Western	62,563.11	491,019.63	229,694.83	454,213.73	24,652.90		47,341.74	708.24	1,308,622.47		
Chicago, St. Paul, Minn. & Omaha	6,252.80	6,602.87	4,608.21	9,825.84	426.31		6,068.16	433.75	35,474.48		
Sioux City & Pacific		1,287.07	1,171.57						2,458.64		
Crooked Creek		16,652.60	6,501.79	10,507.02	242.48		25.25	118.70	26,903.23		
Des Moines Northern & Western	7,956.31	113,333.25	27,328.87	92,308.91	3,511.76		9.27.33	765.39	5,941.41		
Dubuque & Sioux City	59.12	493.98		42.67			108.27	6.91	733.73		
Stacyville railroad		2,404.68		232.77			3,380.16		8,979.61		
Des Moines Union	2,000.00	66,989.71	22,749.76	76,743.00	2,883.35		5,669.31	444.99	195,192.20		
Iowa Central	15,033.15	1,812.34	401.55	1,553.11					3,772.00		
Albia & Centerville											
Iowa Northern	1,800.03	19,912.64	5,290.61	38,909.11	664.48		33.18	148.50	1,247.35		
Keokuk & Western		6,402.49	2,931.92	5,174.42			989.52		15,498.35		
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	6,152.72	95,263.25	31,630.30	80,760.94	2,692.20		17,088.31	618.14	285,784.69		
Minneapolis & St. Louis		394.50	47.29	72.24				1.67	515.70		
Muscatine North & South		20,708.96	7,069.14	7,136.61	1,150.60		1,347.79	113.12	42,066.41		
Omaha & St. Louis	1,866.86	10,737.55	2,276.20	22,918.38			1,218.12		38,140.25		
Sioux City & Northern			78.08	70.71	.21				181.72		
Tabor & Northern											
Union Pacific	127,203.65	787,032.53	398,283.76	565,760.85	14,585.66		100,101.26	4,912.61	2,083,699.86		
Wabash	1,680.00	4,899.70	1,454.27	5,499.08			246.55	35.15	13,814.75		
Winona & Western											
NARROW GAUGE.											
Burlington & Northwestern	330.00	1,503.36	375.92	1,599.67	62.97		56.19	2.41	4,024.84		
Burlington & Western	881.00	5,742.31	572.68	3,311.15	58.90		154.78	2.41	10,844.12		
Total	\$1,025,411.84	\$5,464,651.79	\$2,787,093.61	\$5,872,628.15	\$37,289.41	\$250,254.23	\$714,831.42	\$70,887.56	\$2,083,699.86		



TABLE 31—OPERATING EXPENSES—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	CONDUCTING TRANSPORTATION.									
	Superintendent.	Engine and house men.	Fuel for locomotives.	Water supplies for locomotives.	Oil, tallow and waste for locomotives.	Other supplies for locomotives.	Train service.	Train supplies and expenses.	Switchmen, men and flagmen.	Telegraph expenses.
Ames & College.	\$ 240.00	\$ 474.60	\$ 664.75	\$ 72.00	\$ 70.00		\$ 565.00	\$ 480.00		
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.	288,339.48	1,868,850.58	1,409,994.00	128,916.56	48,553.19	\$ 23,903.91	\$ 1,329,721.17	\$ 301,132.01	\$ 525,517.99	\$ 400,670.93
Boone Valley.	55,063.46	278,590.49	243,501.01	14,494.18	9,988.00	2,434.79	102,932.80	42,888.12	59,539.95	84,898.05
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.	1,967.58	1,480.94					1,331.25			
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N.-W.	421,347.87	2,033,063.62	1,932,591.19	132,032.26	68,114.73	22,433.01	1,448,152.88	429,752.41	802,369.88	411,280.57
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.	6,082.23	25,406.83	20,853.69	1,880.42	504.46	341.19	21,503.45	4,636.80	638.99	8,642.99
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.	33,064.11	126,768.99	126,333.62	11,842.97	3,065.21	2,432.14	88,915.26	56,203.37	63,049.21	27,571.14
Kansas City, St. Joe & Council Bluffs.	33,897.40	112,660.50	97,311.31	6,039.08	3,137.79	65.10	80,638.53	34,763.69	50,431.21	26,680.45
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.	600.00	5,188.22	5,394.87	530.17	136.06	78.21	3,843.94	2,143.71	81.12	1,036.34
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.		2,386.42	2,380.21	8.30		429.38				
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.						49.74	1,681.30	14.98		
Chicago Great Western.	24,846.40	392,273.72	471,804.07	27,169.62	18,445.60		274,274.69	54,714.57	103,448.69	90,412.34
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	331,840.82	2,278,323.38	2,322,674.03	75,158.72	62,054.19	23,165.65	1,809,158.17	221,043.22	732,986.43	521,604.18
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	229,410.50	1,277,343.26	1,131,004.78	88,314.31	30,405.64	18,772.29	916,571.65	250,902.18	468,182.61	251,023.09
Chicago & North-Western.	158,385.57	2,863,394.03	2,518,487.00	125,006.08	90,367.95	39,336.51	2,065,737.24	340,428.42	971,891.99	546,977.51
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & O.	105,057.65	571,266.50	680,894.84	30,330.21	18,274.59	9,207.28	423,944.40	74,137.89	153,200.81	116,994.28
St. Louis City & Pacific.	1,797.53	39,133.82	50,946.68	1,679.99	1,449.75	69.89	27,421.17	6,776.85	12,806.20	6,302.89
Crooked Creek.		3,043.31	2,219.40	60.31						
Des Moines Northern & Western.	7,624.68	20,105.43	23,077.32	2,998.05	768.54	84.29	14,735.19	909.13		6,004.22
Dubuque & Sioux City.	50,899.22	188,442.82	115,549.93	10,227.72	6,189.21	3,703.28	144,168.75	32,218.43	35,260.31	39,055.97
Stacyville railroad.	112.38	1,549.17	707.34	8.27	39.32	31.18	654.60	64.68		248.55
Des Moines Union.	920.00	11,005.20	3,628.35	1,560.10	139.71		5,507.09	250.00	13,876.00	
Iowa Central.	81,105.04	165,458.56	134,773.85	9,769.13	6,041.19	3,035.37	106,756.78	12,555.04	29,917.13	33,952.20
Albia & Centerville.		3,147.60	2,881.28	448.30	374.57	28.10	3,591.75	74.39		725.33
Iowa Northern.			1,815.05	100.06			3,096.00			
Keokuk & Western.	9,900.00	37,438.70	31,220.86	1,789.20	780.00		27,738.31	3,369.96	4,767.93	11,494.75
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.		8,077.27	10,696.82	911.53	747.03		4,918.51	3,747.75		2,261.78
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	2,397.09	133,812.34	153,278.80	7,918.08	4,846.61	1,621.72	85,629.11	18,004.23	40,665.44	25,943.23
Muscatine North & South.	713.83	2,361.60	1,182.58	213.02	66.25	15.58	1,617.58	72.84		513.47
Omaha & St. Louis.	11,171.62	54,068.64	62,481.30	3,893.99	2,048.55	1,130.38	32,101.33	9,360.67	7,712.15	6,639.63
Sioux City & Northern.	2,603.65	14,340.26	21,063.49	7,667.65	816.60		2,235.02	5,277.23	4,177.76	
Tabor & Northern.		1,263.98	672.18		81.53	17.58	401.15	2.00		57.63
Union Pacific.										
Wabash.	144,187.65	1,042,709.63	790,803.74	68,886.56	42,127.30	12,862.80	748,071.23	77,789.15	339,651.44	206,339.09
Winona & Western.	3,900.00	10,815.46	14,928.78	85.00	703.81	71.21	9,928.34	1,196.28	960.00	1,063.00
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.										
Burlington & Northwestern.	1,298.00	3,924.87	2,149.95	312.69		56.26	2,002.52	671.60	543.57	846.66
Burlington & Western.	1,550.13	9,469.67	8,521.09	1,140.39	294.73	99.61	7,485.84	1,314.85	1,834.18	1,014.22
Total.	\$1,991,299.39	\$13,585,422.81	\$12,401,037.97	\$755,061.50	\$421,307.93	\$168,576.26	\$9,882,823.61	\$1,973,731.04	\$4,134,166.40	\$2,827,545.24

TABLE 32—OPERATING EXPENSES—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	Station serv- ice.	Station sup- plies.	Switching charges—bal- ance.	Car mileage— balance.	Hire of equip- ment—bal- ance.	Loss and dam- age.	Injuries to persons.	Clearing wrecks.	Operating marine equipment.
Ames & College.									
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.	\$ 957,747.73	\$ 99,156.48		\$ 432,034.41		\$ 155,297.10	\$ 157,419.10	\$ 17,062.85	
Boone Valley	194,921.68	18,071.29	\$ 9,573.73			9,432.12	21,599.10	3,163.54	
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern	822.00	277.00		157.31	\$ 105.00	51.14			
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.	1,266,216.32	105,058.01	\$ 5,856.22	231,496.31	\$ 59,510.36	164,562.75	106,789.40	15,070.16	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	9,670.17	793.83	58.00	2,076.23	6,829.47	2,411.61	1,171.50	416.09	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City	167,207.09	14,191.76	\$ 10,935.53	38,210.79	33,583.38	8,996.41	9,092.68	1,508.02	
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs	102,300.59	10,218.69	45,435.30	49,092.08	29,576.06	9,782.15	6,163.33	1,696.82	
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.	6,038.60	267.28	940.15	1,116.58	136.05	98.82	5,152.50	49.15	
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.	2,652.89	309.17	100.88	14.21		650.82			
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.	315,092.19	25,456.08	101,090.06	98,137.97	601.56	38,495.16	50,442.12	9,313.40	
Chicago Great Western.	1,417,249.86	139,823.92	271,134.31	299,665.30		121,475.53	165,155.88	16,780.99	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	726,801.95	88,206.91		173,496.28		85,554.68	142,893.27		
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	1,690,269.79	155,843.29	199,001.72	245,261.03	6,409.82	155,802.09	354,041.68	22,953.38	\$ 3,513.00
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.	375,071.84	41,175.21	5,755.60			39,408.09	82,436.67	4,767.67	
Sioux City & Pacific.	29,423.30	3,380.12	7,017.77		14,945.38	1,761.23	10,133.52	115.67	
Crooked Creek.	811.33					55.32			
Des Moines, Northern & Western.	15,638.84	1,217.39	2,518.00			1,376.78	1,595.99	41.49	
Dubuque & Sioux City	97,911.59	11,211.74	4,619.40	51,002.13		9,481.42	16,829.47	1,139.45	
Stacyville railroad	867.05	39.19				8.11	29.50	6.00	
Des Moines Union.	17,496.51	5,156.00					248.30		
Iowa Central.	65,573.23	5,874.30	49,220.85	45,784.76	\$ 2,197.80	12,724.09	5,712.56	5,679.36	
Albia & Centerville	1,601.61	79.95	\$ 16.00	1,322.63		789.08	76.00	271.88	
Iowa Northern.						1,328.10			
Keokuk & Western	25,465.16	945.97	2,826.59			949.36	640.10	14.40	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	5,229.72	460.60		694.80		939.69	610.14	283.00	
Minneapolis & St. Louis	58,421.89	6,069.95				5,168.15	21,259.71	977.64	
Muscatine North & South.	1,997.29	167.61	538.61	383.22		208.87	6.50	170.77	
Omaha & St. Louis	24,173.49	1,777.62	1,892.00	17,832.04	9,711.09	6,459.43	2,524.71	2,620.94	
Sioux City & Northern.	14,640.92	1,543.08				316.09	2,525.43	83.82	
Tabor & Northern.	626.95	9.17		85.57		12.90	131.50	1.50	
Union Pacific.									
Wabash.	1,108,747.87	56,882.94		625,593.08	41,106.45	77,314.97	64,955.05		
Winona & Western	11,876.09	1,106.42	1,853.75		66.00	83.38	128.25	9.45	
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.									
Burlington & Northwestern.	4,875.77	302.17	87.90	119.66		173.36	94.80	20.29	
Burlington & Western	7,864.34	297.52	933.32	246.26		205.80	49.25	34.01	
Total.	\$5,664,436.70	\$13,417.23	\$68,229.53	\$2,224,673.21	\$2,692.20	\$89,037.47	\$1,185,244.57	\$104,189.34	\$3,513.00

\*Credit.



TABLE 33—OPERATING EXPENSES—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	CONDUCTING TRANSPORTATION—CONTINUED.								Total.
	Advertising.	Outside agen- cies.	Commissions.	Stockyards and eleva- tors.	Rents for tracks, yds. and termi- nals.	Rents of buildings and other property.	Stationery and print- ing.	Other ex- penses.	
Ames & College.....									\$ 2,566.35
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	\$ 65,610.67	\$ 303,520.28	\$ 57,000.70		\$ 375,500.27	\$ 22,054.34	\$ 82,189.79	\$ 113,202.55	\$ 9,141,385.06
Boone Valley.....	17,295.99	8,247.65	12,067.05		5,269.32	783.00	20,121.64	5,882.23	1,311,574.19
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	82,145.37	334,421.53			216,906.18		100,976.48	6,096.32	10,265,516.67
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	58.04	1,604.88			11,613.31		200.38	200.38	129,462.87
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	8,526.25	33,003.12			73,180.05		8,318.50	1,766.59	865,023.66
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....	7,062.96	39,824.42			68,434.93		9,677.64	2,559.86	827,409.76
Kansas City, St. Joseph and Council Bluffs.....	54.25	2,251.69	16.95		2,332.25	216.00	2,943.34		36,038.32
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....								509.74	11,228.18
Chicago, Fort Madison & Des Moines.....								44,545.38	2,129,710.91
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	36,785.20	155,171.28		\$ 238.14	373,678.20		21,976.61	59,016.05	11,702,325.22
Chicago Great Western.....	61,406.70	311,940.36		10,530.09	208,635.50	77,764.73	133,212.88	85,552.52	7,074,423.39
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	82,113.25	365,140.15		42,115.37	392,739.88	184,316.36	88,107.85		13,682,669.20
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	103,835.90	336,292.84	399,218.51		85,374.87	15,245.86	134,293.12		3,037,864.88
Chicago & North-Western.....	8,746.27	88,034.99	13,541.00	81,090.36	117,317.24	6,125.46	43,266.12		239,935.55
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	777.27	6,793.10	2,990.91			989.00	3,132.46		6,406.37
Sioux City & Pacific.....								276.68	174,692.58
Crooked Creek.....	424.33	2,265.11	191.13		62,133.77	1,555.01	1,658.69	71.17	892,978.31
Des Moines Northern & Western.....	4,755.02	46,880.68	3,311.16		6,324.46		18,857.35	1,475.82	4,458.43
Dubuque & Sioux City.....							89.04	1.45	59,777.26
Stacyville railroad.....									788,152.65
Des Moines Union.....	5,542.69	13,200.34	4,525.20	1,928.56	25,011.95	2,190.23	12,332.00	2,677.06	14,456.52
Iowa Central.....						60.00			6,708.03
Albia & Centerville.....						180.00		166.83	173,348.85
Iowa Northern.....	464.75	1,494.83			1,000.00	3,431.11	1,615.80	2,767.92	36,001.11
Keokuk & Western.....	39.50	15.98							699,593.61
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	2,599.95	18,192.77	6,876.68		55,694.18	2,789.64	9,358.89	33,086.81	10,264.18
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	49.50	114.41				6.88	168.12	99.15	301,422.34
Muscatine North & South.....	614.81	13,800.97	1,343.78		17,471.94	5,880.71	2,413.13	1,415.38	84,413.30
Omaha & St. Louis.....	97.52	1,004.20			6,000.00				3,465.04
Sioux City & Northern.....	6.50			2.39	5.00		83.70	53.27	
Tabor & Northern.....									
Union Pacific.....	59,788.31	353,519.41	141,637.09		158,523.54	23,389.60	79,812.96	106,766.90	6,350,437.40
Wabash.....	56.75	264.35		57.04	2,612.03		768.04		59,932.93
Winona & Western.....									
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.									
Burlington & Northwestern.....	132.14	731.04			6,720.43	386.84	43.40		25,516.08
Burlington & Western.....	125.42	817.89			800.07		641.34	44.80	44,280.37
Total.....	\$ 554,095.31	\$ 2,488,551.27	\$ 543,220.16	\$ 135,962.49	\$ 2,280,279.37	\$ 347,364.55	\$ 776,728.79	\$ 465,882.68	\$ 70,789,411.34

TABLE 34—OPERATING EXPENSES—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	GENERAL EXPENSE.							
	Salaries of general of- ficers.	Salaries of clerks and attendants.	General office expenses and sup- plies.	Insurance.	Law expenses.	Stationery and print- ing (general of- fice).	Other ex- penses.	Total general expense.
Ames & College.....				\$ 70.50		\$ 191.60	\$ 60.47	\$ 322.57
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe .....	\$ 119,386.90	\$ 218,962.01	\$ 99,735.10	42,523.65	\$ 136,503.01	23,767.12	10,259.91	651,137.70
Boone Valley.....								
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern .....	38,803.09	45,284.75	4,747.40	8,029.04	14,110.19	5,577.95	3,773.46	120,330.88
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern .....	2,651.17		541.19		176.00			3,368.26
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	276,275.99	270,807.59	87,249.66	111,536.15	178,263.74	19,795.33	70,255.82	1,014,281.28
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....	3,014.35	3,864.76	569.22	1,087.80	3,303.26	589.28	773.26	13,201.93
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs. ....	26,255.37	24,017.32	2,103.46	5,192.03	18,917.19	2,380.74	5,264.86	84,130.97
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....	23,281.92	20,256.15	3,697.79	3,919.93	35,329.04	2,977.50	4,118.62	93,580.95
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	5,370.24	1,214.49	120.51	314.79	1,943.00		2,513.81	11,476.84
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	1,345.00	513.22	533.58	150.00		270.41	306.50	3,118.71
Chicago Great Western.....	80,328.27	67,071.54	28,860.10	11,100.00	41,019.71	5,697.64	43,067.82	307,135.08
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	241,224.87	205,703.09	45,565.32	96,306.57	69,432.44	16,613.17	199,103.17	873,948.63
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific .....	*341,218.40		18,365.53	7,741.86	79,299.12	30,638.42	252,587.82	729,851.15
Chicago & North-Western.....	146,424.98	333,464.55	89,044.75	2,346.39	168,670.82	21,744.68	13,329.64	775,025.81
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha. ....	76,908.42	61,480.78	12,198.04	9,635.18	14,725.22	7,288.23	25,144.66	210,380.53
Sioux City & Pacific.....	4,522.20	7,759.96	967.34	2.65	1,561.43	235.59	3.25	15,052.42
Crooked Creek.....	3,080.00						884.89	3,964.89
Des Moines, Northern & Western .....	8,250.00	2,484.40	23,056.99	161.99	745.35	209.12	1,632.62	36,540.47
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	17,250.37	22,776.44	7,588.04	11,739.60	11,981.64	2,751.43	7,280.20	81,367.72
Stacyville railroad.....			1.82	1.13				2.95
Des Moines Union.....	3,100.00	1,350.00	808.00	485.05	892.70	213.00		6,798.75
Iowa Central.....	23,689.92	19,989.78	4,074.86	1,560.00	1,083.71	3,303.43	7,694.87	61,346.37
Albia & Centerville.....		600.00		16.03	443.97	67.65	8.94	1,136.59
Iowa Northern.....	600.00	580.00		475.66				1,655.66
Keokuk & Western.....	12,034.81	9,183.18	580.87	1,102.52	3,419.55	743.29	7,609.65	34,763.87
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	5,882.50	2,324.00	6,677.88	547.11	452.75	1,339.24		17,223.48
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	52,966.25	32,461.77	3,381.62	3,617.48	11,253.71	2,221.65	14,377.75	120,283.23
Muscatine, North & South .....	210.00	594.95	517.61	12.25		134.18	27.22	1,546.21
Omaha & St. Louis.....	4,696.95	5,333.19	1,767.01	1,558.06	1,289.85	1,113.46	465.03	16,223.55
Sioux City & Northern .....	9,886.95	7,913.80	286.53	1,575.25	1,207.50	3,185.75	490.31	21,547.09
Tabor & Northern.....	243.67		32.46	32.00	52.60	48.35	6.10	415.18
Union Pacific.....								
Wabash.....	43,365.20	38,683.76	306.45	23,344.52	61,289.02	19,544.49	53,136.12	239,663.55
Winona & Western.....	1,200.00	480.00	1,119.36	437.89	10.00	284.01	544.98	4,176.24
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.								
Burlington & Northwestern .....	2,117.76	1,270.07	220.95	325.20	25	184.42		4,118.65
Burlington & Western.....	2,502.24	1,663.73	243.08	381.30	60.19	170.89		5,024.43
Total.....	\$ 1,578,692.79	\$ 1,441,092.29	\$ 445,062.52	\$ 317,281.78	\$ 857,486.96	\$ 173,383.01	\$ 724,801.75	\$ 5,567,141.89

\* Includes clerks.



TABLE 35—OPERATING EXPENSES—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	RECAPITULATION OF EXPENSES.					
	Maintenance of way and structures.	Maintenance of equipment.	Conducting transportation.	General expenses.	Grand total.	Percentage of expenses to earnings.
Ames & College.....	\$ 142.39	\$ 887.70	\$ 2,566.35	\$ 322.57	\$ 3,919.01	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	4,257,845.75	3,052,248.48	9,141,385.06	651,137.70	17,100,616.99	63.79
Boone Valley.....	1,145,764.32	640,938.96	5,673.27	120,330.88	1,907,667.43	5.67
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	2,823.97	234.56	1,311,574.19	3,217,966.20	4,533,569.92	67.69
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	4,742,748.79	3,677,978.17	10,265,516.67	1,014,384.28	19,700,527.91	59.10
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	111,398.82	38,313.18	129,463.87	13,201.93	292,376.80	70.20
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....	400,626.96	173,371.35	865,023.66	84,180.97	1,523,182.91	69.90
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.....	398,877.53	231,450.64	837,409.70	93,580.95	1,548,318.88	66.10
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....	30,004.81	4,573.79	36,038.32	11,476.84	82,093.76	99.39
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	5,753.04	1,636.14	11,226.15	3,118.71	21,739.07	
Chicago Great Western.....	727,395.38	568,335.42	2,729,710.91	207,135.08	4,332,576.79	74.00
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	6,970,697.14	3,229,699.43	11,702,325.22	873,948.63	23,776,670.42	59.45
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	3,208,561.41	2,011,495.71	7,074,423.39	729,851.15	13,124,331.66	63.56
Chicago & North-Western.....	4,743,008.31	6,159,691.72	13,682,669.20	775,025.81	24,360,395.04	68.37
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	1,737,738.21	1,308,622.47	3,037,864.88	210,380.53	6,314,606.09	60.27
Sioux City & Pacific.....	6,629.65	35,474.48	229,035.55	15,032.42	321,092.10	60.44
Crooked Creek.....	4,492.60	2,438.64	6,465.37	3,964.89	17,362.50	150.01
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....	85,916.47	34,047.84	174,692.58	36,540.47	331,197.36	63.30
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	430,313.40	259,693.23	892,978.31	81,367.72	1,664,352.66	56.03
Stacyville railroad.....	1,284.04	783.73	4,458.43	2.95	6,529.15	90.55
Des Moines Union.....	16,141.44	8,970.61	59,777.28	6,798.75	91,696.06	100.00
Iowa Central.....	473,490.21	196,199.30	788,152.65	61,344.57	1,419,178.63	71.58
Albia & Centerville.....	14,785.13	3,472.00	14,456.32	1,136.59	33,850.04	82.93
Iowa Northern.....	3,494.27		6,708.03	1,655.66	11,858.06	
Keokuk & Western.....	109,698.42	69,005.88	173,328.85	34,763.87	386,797.02	65.95
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	49,050.22	15,498.35	36,091.11	17,223.48	117,863.16	56.37
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	460,655.26	235,754.49	699,593.51	120,293.23	1,516,316.69	67.33
Muscatine North & South.....	2,699.84	515.70	10,264.18	1,546.21	14,453.93	117.49
Omaha & St. Louis.....	115,080.09	42,080.41	301,422.34	16,223.55	474,806.39	98.40
Sioux City & Northern.....	49,570.08	38,140.25	84,413.36	24,547.09	196,670.78	58.17
Tabor & Northern.....	3,949.47	181.72	3,465.04	415.18	8,011.41	59.68
Union Pacific.....						
Wabash.....	1,896,190.55	2,083,899.86	6,350,437.40	239,669.55	10,569,997.36	73.43
Winona & Western.....	47,824.27	13,514.75	59,032.96	4,176.24	124,548.19	67.75
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.						
Burlington & Northwestern.....	14,505.52	4,024.84	22,516.08	4,118.65	48,165.00	52.50
Burlington & Western.....	31,066.38	10,844.12	44,280.37	4,904.05	91,094.92	80.90
Total.....	\$ 32,448,619.11	\$ 23,152,757.02	\$ 70,795,086.61	\$ 5,567,081.51	\$ 131,063,503.25	

TABLE 36—TAXES.

RAILROADS.	ILLINOIS.			MISSOURI.			MINNESOTA.			WISCONSIN.		
	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.
Ames & College.....	\$ 115,142.87	280.42	\$ 470.61	\$ 63,361.62	293.02	\$ 212.82	\$ 105,459.86	411.67	\$ 474.80	\$ 132,120.73	683.78	\$ 193.22
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....							7,329.12					
Boone Valley.....							92.88	78.76				
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....												
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	476,429.31	1,402.38	339.69	15,461.77	116.76	132.42	23.61				222.51	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....				8,163.17	103.82	78.63						
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....				36,090.53	253.47	142.27						
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....				31,418.78	174.80	179.74						
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....												
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....												
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....												
Chicago Great Western.....	67,430.97	152.54	442.05	13,487.76	84.46	159.89	16,777.41	145.62	115.21			
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	149,536.34	317.94	470.33	20,603.91	140.27	146.88	198,485.46	1,120.09	177.20	457,108.06	1,650.46	276.95
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	194,850.31	226.51	823.86	51,750.91	286.91	180.37	766,949.94	376.94	177.61	240,202.04	167.32	210.57
Chicago & North-Western.....	228,252.62	593.97	451.63				66,993.86	414.47	161.63	430,717.74	1,683.23	394.24
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....							145,080.54	405.75	357.66	151,289.47	621.66	243.36
Sioux City & Pacific.....												
Crooked Creek.....												
Des Moines Northern & Western.....												
Dubuque & Sioux City.....												
Stacyville railroad.....												
Des Moines Union.....												
Iowa Central.....	16,067.61	80.76	185.85									
Albia & Centerville.....												
Iowa Northern.....				15,320.31	81.56	186.73						
Keokuk & Western.....							60,159.69	328.97	182.81			
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....												
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....												
Muscatine North & South.....				7,007.02	77.67							
Omaha & St. Louis.....							784.40	11.31	69.35			
Sioux City & Northern.....												
Tabor & Northern.....												
Union Pacific.....												
Wabash.....	233,385.00			102,471.00			3,786.87	59.70	42.24			
Winona & Western.....												
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.												
Burlington & Northwestern.....												
Burlington & Western.....												
Total.....	\$ 1,520,694.91	3,073.97		\$ 364,116.78	1,612.74		\$ 761,783.15	3,421.11		\$ 1,211,438.05	4,951.52	

\*Colorado. †New Mexico. ‡Oklahoma.



TABLE 37—TAXES—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	NEBRASKA.			KANSAS.			SOUTH DAKOTA.			MICHIGAN.		
	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.
Ames & College.....				\$624,629.12	2,551.35	\$244.89						
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....												
Boone Valley.....							\$ 7,687.56	82.76	\$ 92.89			
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....												
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....												
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	\$442,412.71	2,252.31	\$196.44	42,005.24	259.62	161.80	18,691.36	200.53	93.21	\$78,601.18	355.14	\$221.32
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....												
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....				1,816.54								
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....												
Chicago, Fort Madison & Des Moines.....												
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....												
Chicago Great Western.....				7,787.89								
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	706.19			781.28			106,937.32	1,101.06	96.30	8,643.67	152.00	56.86
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	49,840.23	250.44	199.01	295,547.30	1,124.30	262.87						
Chicago & North-Western.....	\$ 1,218.78	14.28	85.35				71,135.64	741.13	95.60	58,594.94	521.19	112.42
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	52,629.79	274.57	191.68				9,132.08	88.20	103.51			
Sioux City & Pacific.....	3,105.44	26.95	115.23									
Crooked Creek.....												
Des Moines Northern & Western.....												
Dubuque & Sioux City.....												
Stacyville railroad.....												
Des Moines Union.....												
Iowa Central.....												
Albia & Centerville.....												
Iowa Northern.....												
Keokuk & Western.....												
Mason City & Fort Dodge.....												
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....							1,083.33	40.08	27.03			
Muscatine North & South.....												
Omaha & St. Louis.....	4.25											
Sioux City & Northern.....							979.06	7.99	122.54			
Tabor & Northern.....												
Union Pacific.....												
Wabash.....										20,600.00		
Winona & Western.....												
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.												
Burlington & Northwestern.....												
Burlington & Western.....												
Total.....	\$550,037.39	2,818.55		\$972,546.87	3,935.27		\$214,746.29	2,264.75		\$166,439.79	1,028.33	

‡North Dakota.

TABLE 38—TAXES—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	OTHER STATES.			IOWA.			TOTAL TAXES.		
	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.	Amount.	Miles of road.	Per mile.
Ames & College.....				\$ 75.50	1.98	\$ 40.00	\$ 75.50	1.98	\$ 40.00
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	\$ 71,427.76	410.33	\$ 50.00	9,396.88	19.86	473.16	1,210,538.83	4,650.43	260.37
Boone Valley.....				84.27	3.00	28.00	84.27	3.00	28.00
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....				131,737.45	960.73	137.12	146,748.08	1,136.47	129.12
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....									
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	b 34,836.86	367.34	100.00	175,453.75	839.62	208.97	1,283,922.18	6,040.33	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....	d 519.05			7,484.05	77.74	96.27	16,166.27	181.56	89.00
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....	d 4,443.77			6,968.21	57.38	121.44	49,235.05	310.85	158.00
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....	d 5,718.14			4,588.88	51.00	89.98	41,725.80	225.80	184.00
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....				5,122.33	71.10	72.15	5,122.33	71.10	72.15
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....				1,780.19	26.40	67.43	1,780.19	26.40	67.43
Chicago Great Western.....	13.61			71,043.54	462.23	153.70	176,540.68	844.85	208.93
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	12,021.10	118.21	101.69	1,553.47	149.45	10.45	1,186,176.40	6,153.50	192.76
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	c 2,935.62	108.19	27.13	232,173.23	1,068.76	215.07	931,933.89	3,619.37	257.49
Chicago & North-Western.....	1,104.57			223,446.96	1,163.12	192.11	1,121,465.11	5,076.89	230.90
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....				25,419.83	102.05	249.09	383,551.71	1,492.23	257.03
Sioux City & Pacific.....				16,093.84	80.47	200.00	19,199.28	26.95	115.23
Crooked Creek.....				1,132.44	17.61	64.30	1,132.44	17.61	64.30
Des Moines Northern & Western.....									
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	2,583.43	26.35	98.04	d 104,877.75	523.74	182.96	107,461.18	599.59	179.22
Stacyville railroad.....				d 413.73	7.93	52.17	413.73	7.93	52.17
Des Moines Union.....				6,809.22	3.70	18.40	6,809.22	3.70	18.40
Iowa Central.....				48,508.91	415.72	116.68	65,176.62	505.58	123.91
Albia & Centerville.....				1,482.58	24.44	60.66	1,482.58	24.44	60.66
Iowa Northern.....				400.33	6.93	57.76	400.33	6.93	57.76
Keokuk & Western.....				17,895.97	173.09	103.39	33,226.28	254.65	130.47
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....				10,501.88	92.00	114.15	10,501.88	92.00	114.15
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....				19,560.00	139.51	140.21	80,783.02	508.56	166.55
Muscatine North & South.....				1,200.00	28.07	41.65	1,200.00	28.07	41.65
Omaha & St. Louis.....				7,161.50	65.79	144.35	14,172.77	143.39	
Sioux City & Northern.....				11,256.31	77.98	22.43	13,019.77	97.28	133.84
Tabor & Northern.....				197.97	8.79	22.43	197.97	8.79	22.43
Union Pacific.....				24,000.00	2.46	9,710.00	24,000.00	2.46	9,710.00
Wabash.....	190,035.00			12,400.00			557,881.00		
Winona & Western.....				1,642.33	23.50	69.88	6,431.20	113.20	47.97
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.									
Burlington & Northwestern.....				2,145.64	38.73	55.40	2,145.64	38.73	55.40
Burlington & Western.....				3,152.47	70.70	44.59	3,152.47	70.70	43.59
Total.....	\$ 325,638.91	930.42		\$1,415,465.40	8,260.03		\$7,502,903.67	32,385.82	

a Oklahoma and Texas. b Montana and Wyoming. c Indian territory. d Federal war tax included. ‡ North Dakota.



TABLE 39—CURRENT ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.

176

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE

BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS.

177

RAILROADS.	CASH AND CURRENT ASSETS AVAILABLE FOR PAYMENT OF CURRENT LIABILITIES.								Total.
	Cash.	Bills receivable.	Due from agents.	Net traffic freight balance due from other companies.	Due from solvent companies and individuals.	Other cash assets including materials and supplies.	Balance current liabilities.		
Ames & College								\$ 7,817,477.90	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.	\$ 5,145,592.45	\$ 43,814.88	\$ 159,332.72		\$ 2,468,737.87				
Boone Valley								1,446,676.04	
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.	990,798.71	110,000.00	104,535.93	\$ 66,443.68	112,046.46	\$ 62,861.26	\$ 3,695.08	7,806.82	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.	1,026.25		72.58		3,012.61			10,566,306.55	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	7,093,938.00	1,995,651.77	6,212.90		2,047,086.13	22,807.75	32,155.94	81,676.73	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City	23,664.93	789.92	1,992.96		23,774.96			698,689.88	
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.	256,010.85	142,853.00	11,063.58		280,919.21	4,838.24		613,829.78	
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.	131,194.59	305,972.19	38,129.87		336,030.30	2,502.83		17,164.26	
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.	8,296.26		4,283.35		1,590.08		2,884.57		
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.								1,317,091.23	
Chicago Great Western	742,374.45		145,442.64		347,630.19		\$ 2,324.95	7,232,230.16	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	6,377,491.81		374,314.54		174,107.60	\$ 303,316.21		3,359,569.55	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	1,633,306.02	168,226.75	509,000.57		959,036.21			6,990,801.53	
Chicago & North-Western.	4,056,419.89	139,216.53	2,154,650.80		276,340.68	\$ 364,173.63		3,429,307.10	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.	2,277,161.70	246.35	352,522.68	200,345.08		509,131.29		274,216.45	
Sioux City & Pacific	142,268.49		131,947.96				6,929.94	13,350.22	
Crooked Creek			94.49		5,838.45			158,776.69	
Des Moines, Northern & Western.		2,500.00	10,963.58		142,032.05	\$ 281.06		927,735.49	
Dubuque & Sioux City.		4,410.00			923,081.67	243.89		3,077.39	
Stacyville railroad.						47,919.44		25,554.75	
Des Moines Union.		24,010.40						192,808.35	
Iowa Central.	34,485.12		67,347.40	95,209.62	138,432.43			17,434.65	
Albia & Centerville.	873.81		199.87	905.21	9,283.67			528,282.92	
Iowa Northern.						141.00		141.00	
Keokuk & Western.	90,200.74		1,955.89		16,792.90			109,039.53	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.	5,990.28	4,511.66	2,552.74	8,214.37	211,092.49	43.75	\$ 35,084.38	1,097,489.67	
Minneapolis & St. Louis	269,776.83		63,643.02		30,676.28			286,823.47	
Muscatine North & South.	2,294.58		498.56		10,933.48			3,785.91	
Omaha & St. Louis	17,789.56		4,852.61		5,712.02			356,407.48	
Sioux City & Northern	31,940.42		11,813.49		28,598.58	142,748.65		214,482.32	
Tabor & Northern.	2,518.94		93.90		554.80			37,709.07	
Union Pacific.	747,086.53	14,466.59	\$ 113,730.68		885,290.22	81,053.49	1,485,086.72	3,427,604.03	
Wabash.	55,303.74		2,509.02	5,424.13	9,308.60	\$ 287.40		78,831.89	
Winona & Western.									
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.									
Burlington & Northwestern.	3,312.35	1,072.10	721.05	587.19	63,360.72		143,831.66	212,875.07	
Burlington & Western.	10,453.21	50.00	3,139.74	39.35	2,659.34		630,381.65	646,723.29	
Total.	\$ 30,155,157.51	\$ 2,257,797.00	\$ 4,467,099.12	\$ 383,992.78	\$ 9,500,089.27	\$ 1,638,349.82	\$ 1,341,998.72	\$ 52,754,454.32	

\*United States Government bonds. †Miscellaneous.

TABLE 40—CURRENT ASSETS AND LIABILITIES—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	CURRENT LIABILITIES ACCRUED TO AND INCLUDING JUNE 30, 1899.										Materials and supplies on hand.
	Loans and bills payable.	Audited vouchers and accounts.	Wages and salaries.	Net traffic balances due other companies.	Dividends not called for.	Matured coupons unpaid.	Rents due July 1st.	Miscellaneous.	Balance cash assets.	Total.	
Ames & College											
Atchison, T. & S. Fe.	\$ 1,214,893.91	\$ 980,853.99	\$ 182,163.93			\$ 179,250.00			\$ 5,290,313.14	\$ 7,817,477.90	\$ 1,642,889.70
Boone Valley											
Burlington, O. R. & N.	118,085.12	274,870.16							1,053,720.76	1,446,676.04	257,442.80
Cedar Rapids, G. & N-W	2,700.00	4,888.97		237.55						7,806.52	7,806.52
Chicago, Burl. & Quincy	1,653,467.46	575,195.43	85,406.55	\$ 2,358.25	1,702,341.00			\$ 144,943.67	6,402,594.19	10,566,306.55	1,961,320.22
Chicago, Burl. & K. C.	31,855.79	12,890.94			35,900.00					81,676.73	
Kan. C. St. J. & C. B.	285,506.07	78,890.98			176,410.50				174,881.73	698,689.88	173,273.10
St. Louis, K. & N-W	178,980.28	316,237.96	68,433.61					1,000.00	48,557.93	613,829.78	57,638.84
Chicago, Ft. M. & D. M.	873.77	5,324.74	4,469.60	4,167.01				2,328.14		17,154.26	2,293.20
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota											
Chicago Great Western	622,266.91	266,618.09				2,002.00		426,804.23		1,317,091.23	338,299.56
Chicago, Mil. & St. Paul	870,540.79	1,518,444.52	8,878.82	52,544.58	3,270,357.10			212,716.03	1,398,748.31	7,232,230.16	2,467,734.88
Chicago, Rock I. & Pac.	697,377.81	640,958.77	45,554.43	32,282.95		238,735.52	\$ 8,000.00	1,400,475.50	1,940,475.59	3,359,569.55	652,884.71
Chicago & North-Western		1,539,233.75	1,631,740.66	233,191.96	10,822.73			1,900,901.52	6,990,801.53	17,960,074.00	1,786,074.00
Chicago, St. P. M. & O.	363,370.32	383,519.96	185,767.35	395,574.00		9,692.27		549,745.34	1,523,456.16	3,429,307.10	577,566.95
Sioux City & Pacific	28,527.35	31,167.41	29,275.49		50,310.00				132,896.20	274,216.45	28,108.45
Crooked Creek		13,350.32								13,350.22	
Des Moines, Nor. & W.	287.77			22,707.58		58,660.00		5,449.11	71,672.23	158,776.69	
Dubuque & Sioux City		91,130.16			1,803.05	3,237.50			831,564.78	927,735.49	
Stacyville railroad		3,077.39								3,077.39	
Des Moines Union	59,273.78	10,784.24	7,371.02					20,055.00		97,484.65	5,554.75
Iowa Central	285,000.00	263,036.78	55,332.16	30,927.64		15,900.00	810.00	1,275.97		528,282.92	207,536.54
Albia & Centerville		5,810.50	1,114.68					150.00	4,249.38	11,324.56	
Iowa Northern									141.00	141.00	
Keokuk & Western	59,381.00	25,624.00	2,820.77						21,213.76	109,039.53	37,819.20
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	5,093.75	5,942.49				1,076,400.00		10,053.43		1,097,489.67	16,481.54
Minneapolis & St. Louis	329,501.26	84,501.97		7,030.76		25,100.00		220,811.37		659,919.60	167,960.95
Muscatine North & S.	4,653.34									17,512.53	1,367.00
Omaha & St. Louis	1,910.21	124,714.92	89,080.45						290,791.80	456,497.38	16,521.65
Sioux City & Northern	1,854.57	18,732.31	663.36			384,000.00		21,927.06		429,207.02	42,730.90
Tabor & Northern	11,848.28	255.04	422.45			19,135.94	5.00			31,176.71	2,140.00
Union Pacific											
Wabash	880,472.70	1,244,581.62	474,385.22	158,809.44		185,292.00		483,973.05		3,427,604.03	709,517.71
Winona & Western		2,674.58	7,537.63						62,599.65	72,831.59	5,965.79
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.											
Burlington & Northw'n.	9,664.42		182.85			203,028.00				212,875.07	
Burlington & Western	66,372.29		599.60			579,754.00				646,723.29	
Total	\$ 1,881,128.89	\$ 9,759,737.65	\$ 6,768,106.73	\$ 1,062,140.78	\$ 463,102.63	\$ 8,290,935.56	\$ 16,507.27	\$ 3,494,232.11	\$ 31,028,574.60	\$ 52,754,454.32	\$ 11,187,506.13



TABLE 41—MILEAGE—ENTIRE LINE.

RAILROADS.	Total mileage operated, including yard tracks and siding.	New line constructed during year.	MILEAGE OPERATED—SINGLE TRACK.							MILEAGE OWNED BY COMPANY MAKING REPORT—SINGLE TRACK.					RAILS.		
			LINE REPRESENTED BY CAPITAL STOCK		Line of proprietary companies.	Line operated under lease.	Line operated under contract, etc.	New line constructed during year.	Total mileage excluding trackage rights.	Line operated under trackage rights.	LINE REPRESENTED BY CAPITAL STOCK		Line of proprietary companies.	New line constructed during year.	Total mileage.	Miles of iron.	Miles of steel.
			Main line.	Branches and spurs.							Main line.	Branches and spurs.					
Ames & College.....	1.98		1.98							1.98					1.98		
Atchison, Topeka & S. F.	5,756.14		1,595.10	2,907.81	132.80		14.72		4,650.43	37.38	1,595.10	2,907.81			4,502.91	109.40	4,393.50
Boone Valley.....	3.00		3.00								3.00				3.00		
Burlington, C. R. & N.	1,308.00		248.82	204.34	673.24		5.68		1,125.08	11.39	241.82	204.34			446.16		446.16
Cedar Rapids, G. & N.-W.	27.38		19.38						19.38	8.00	19.38				19.38		19.38
Chicago, B. & Q.	7,850.08	11.67	830.80	5,209.52				.05	6,040.33	190.60	830.81	5,209.52		.05	6,040.33	340.01	5,732.00
Chicago, B. & K. C.	236.55	.30	181.56						181.56	39.39	181.56				181.56	27.82	153.74
K. C., St. Jo. & C. B.	391.90	4.85	189.81	113.60					303.41	6.09	189.81	121.04			310.85	31.60	279.25
St. Louis, K. & N.-W.	376.72	1.52	166.78	59.02					225.80	38.74	166.78	59.02			225.80	31.82	193.98
Chicago, Ft. M. & D. M.	78.60		71.00						71.00		71.00				71.00		71.00
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.	29.57		26.40	3.17					29.57		26.40				26.40		26.40
Chicago, Great Western....	1,130.20		712.84	132.01					844.85	87.16	712.84	132.01			844.85		844.85
Chicago, M. & St. P.	8,006.31	68.09	6,147.10						6,147.90	42.77	6,147.90				6,147.90	419.78	5,728.12
Chicago, Rock I. & P.	4,591.22	99.51	500.20	2,428.42	352.70			51.23	3,281.32	368.05	500.20	2,428.42		51.23	2,928.62	32.74	2,895.88
Chicago & North-Western	7,888.50	142.78	1,927.39	1,901.01	1,188.47		60.02		5,076.89	8.73	1,927.39	1,901.01			3,828.40	120.45	3,698.95
Chicago, St. P., M. & O.	1,958.32	11.59	1,422.64						1,422.64	69.59	1,422.64				1,422.64		
Sioux City & Pacific....	138.68	.37	107.42						107.42		107.42				107.42	4.87	102.55
Crooked Creek.....	20.00		17.61	3.28					20.69		17.61	3.28			20.69		146.77
Des Moines, N. & W.	159.89		146.77						146.77	2.12	146.77				146.77		146.77
Dubuque & Sioux City....	714.19		326.58	273.01					599.59		326.58	273.01			599.59		599.59
Stacyville railroad.....	9.30		7.93						7.93		7.93				7.93		7.93
Des Moines Union.....	17.70		3.70						3.70		3.70				3.70		3.70
Iowa Central.....	597.65		361.89	141.02		2.57			505.48	3.50	361.89	141.02			502.91	78.65	424.26
Albia & Centerville....	27.56		24.44						24.44		24.44				24.44		24.44
Iowa Northern.....	7.93		6.93						6.93		6.93				6.93		6.93
Keokuk & Western.....	297.84		254.65				5.00		259.65		254.65				254.65		254.65
Mason City & Ft. Dodge..	101.02		92.00						92.00		92.00				92.00		92.00
Minneapolis & St. Louis..	627.29		259.90	238.55			1.71		508.56	10.11	272.99	238.55			511.54	1.46	510.08
Muscatine North & South	31.62		28.67	.69					29.36		28.67	.69			29.36		29.36
Omaha & St. Louis.....	164.75		143.39						143.39	.31	143.39				143.39		143.73
Sioux City & Northern....	121.34		96.00		1.28				97.28		96.00				96.00		96.00
Tabor & Northern.....	9.79		8.79						8.79		8.79				8.79	3.00	5.79
Union Pacific.....																	
Wabash.....	2,926.40		1,570.00	24.00	211.00	69.80			1,874.90	446.20	1,570.00	24.00			1,594.00		1,594.00
Winona & Western.....	126.26		113.20						113.20		113.20				113.20		113.20
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.																	
Burlington & N.-W.	60.87	.10	38.73						38.73	13.76	38.73				38.73	15.45	23.28
Burlington & Western....	169.60		70.70						70.70		70.70				70.70	53.20	17.50
Total.....	45,624.16	340.78	17,723.90	13,635.46	1,994.51	567.56	155.32	52.98	34,079.67	1,353.92	17,731.20	13,645.72		51.27	31,364.53	1,279.45	28,678.97

TABLE 42—MILEAGE—IOWA.

RAILROADS.	MILEAGE OWNED IN IOWA.					RAILS.		MILEAGE OPERATED BY ROADS MAKING REPORT.									
	Single track.	Second track.	Third track.	Yard track and siding.	Mileage owned (all tracks).	Miles of iron.	Miles of steel.	LINE OPERATED BY CAPITAL STOCK.		Line of proprietary companies.	Line operated under lease.	Line operated under contract, etc.	New line built during year.	Total mileage, excluding trackage rights.	Line operated under trackage rights.		
								Main line.	Branches and spurs.								
Ames & College.....	1.98				1.98		1.98	1.98						1.98			
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	19.86			22.89	42.75	5.91	36.84	19.86						19.86			
Boone Valley.....	3.00				3.00		3.00							3.00			
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern	446.16			85.09	531.25		531.25	229.25	204.34	510.07		5.68		949.34		11.39	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern	18.38			1.00	19.38		19.38							18.38		8.00	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.	839.62	98.23		259.51	1,177.36	207.54	969.82	232.52	557.10					839.62		46.96	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City	77.74			6.51	84.25	6.51	77.74	77.74						77.74		39.39	
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs	57.38			10.86	67.74	5.23	62.51	49.63	2.17					51.80		1.57	
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern	51.39			4.82	56.21	29.67	26.54	3.05	48.01					51.06		.71	
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines	71.00			7.60	78.60		71.00							71.00			
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	26.40			3.17	29.57		26.40							26.40			
Chicago Great Western.....	462.23			73.67	535.90	3.78	532.12	371.00	91.23					462.23		3.12	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	1,552.48	2.03	2.26	302.13	1,865.90	247.32	1,618.58	1,552.48						1,552.48		3.96	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	760.89	50.35		200.58	1,011.82	231.82	780.00	318.11	442.78		305.71			1,066.00		2.16	
Chicago & North-Western	1,163.12	123.86		348.95	1,635.93	126.78	1,509.15	353.12	810.00					1,163.12		3.07	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	74.55			24.08	98.63	17.41	57.11	74.55						74.55		27.50	
Sioux City & Pacific.....	80.47			25.33	105.80	24.76	82.01	80.47						80.47			
Crooked Creek.....	17.61			3.23	20.89	3.28	17.61	17.61						17.61			
Des Moines Northern & Western.	146.77			11.00	157.77	11.00	146.77	146.77						146.77		2.12	
Dubuque & Sioux City....	573.24	.61	82.67	106.41	682.93	30.10	652.83	326.58	246.66					573.24			
Stacyville railroad.....	7.93			1.37	9.30		7.93							7.93			
Des Moines Union.....	3.70	2.00		12.00	17.70		17.70	3.70						3.70			
Iowa Central.....	414.25			77.09	491.34	119.25	372.09	273.23	141.02		1.47			415.72			
Albia & Centerville....	24.44			3.12	27.56	3.08	24.44							24.44			
Iowa Northern.....	6.93			1.00	7.93	1.00	6.93							6.93			
Keokuk & Western.....	173.09			31.11	205.20	31.11	173.09	173.09						173.09		2.50	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge..	92.00			9.02	101.02	1.19	99.83	88.10	3.90					92.00			
Minneapolis & St. Louis...	139.51			17.19	156.70	18.15	138.55	138.05	1.46				1.71	139.51			
Muscatine North & South	28.67			2.95	31.62		31.62	28.67	.69					28.67			
Omaha & St. Louis.....	65.72			8.59	74.31	8.59	65.72	65.72						65.72		.34	
Sioux City & Northern....	76.70			9.78	87.48		76.70	76.70			1.28			77.98			
Tabor & Northern.....	8.79			1.00	9.79	4.00	5.79	8.79						8.79			



TABLE 42—MILEAGE—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	MILEAGE OWNED IN IOWA.					RAILS.		MILEAGE OPERATED BY ROADS MAKING REPORT.						
	Single track.	Second track.	Third track.	Yard track and siding.	Mileage owned (all trucks).	Miles of road.	Miles of steel.	LINE OPERATED BY CAPITAL STOCK.		Line of proprietary companies.	Line operated under lease.	Line operated under contract, etc.	New line built during year.	Total mileage, excluding track-age rights.
Union Pacific.....	2.46	1.63	.....	27.82	31.91	.....	.....	Main line.	Branches and spurs.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wabash.....	26.70	.....	.....	9.70	26.40	.....	36.40	43.46	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Winona & Western.....	23.50	.....	.....	8.61	26.11	.....	39.11	33.20	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.														
Burlington & Northwestern.....	38.73	.....	.....	8.37	47.10	21.72	25.38	38.73	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	38.73
Burlington & Western.....	70.70	.....	.....	5.40	76.10	58.60	17.50	70.70	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	70.70
Total.....	7,706.99	278.71	11.93	1,704.50	9,701.73	1,216.93	8,431.61	9,549.36	510.07	308.46	49.08	11.71	8,514.51	800.03

\* Connecting track. † In report for 1898, error was made in adding trackage rights (3.96 miles) to "total excluding trackage rights," hence this figure is smaller than last year by that amount. ‡ Line from Judd to Border Plains, 4.80 miles, abandoned and track removed. § Additional track. ¶ Included in total mileage.

TABLE 43—EMPLOYES AND SALARIES—IOWA.

RAILROADS.	GEN'L OFFICERS.			OTHER OFFICERS.			GEN. OFFICE CL'KS.			STATION AGENTS.			OTHER STATIONMEN.			ENGINEERS.		
	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	A. v. daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	A. v. daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	A. v. daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	A. v. daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	A. v. daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	A. v. daily compensation.
Ames & College.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	474.00	\$1.30
Atchison, Topeka & S. P.	.....	.....	.....	5	7,800.00	4.33	.....	.....	.....	3	2,374.00	\$3.38	11	5,841.96	\$1.63	58	69,327.00	3.70
Boone Valley.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Burl. Cedar Rap. & Nor.	11	\$8,808.09	\$9.67	70	70,714.95	2.43	72	45,234.75	\$3.01	158	92,249.50	1.87	182	77,847.12	1.37	102	130,643.00	3.80
Cedar Rapids, G. & N-W.	3	1,989.00	3.90	.....	.....	.....	.....	297.50	1.75	5	1,487.50	1.75	.....	.....	.....	1	712.50	3.75
Chicago, Burl. & Quincy	16	79,591.54	13.62	.....	.....	.....	41	45,689.61	3.05	129	77,086.17	1.63	334	138,224.29	1.31	187	231,369.80	3.24
Chicago, Burl. & K. C.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14	7,008.00	1.37	3	340.80	.32	13	16,125.48	3.40
Kansas C., St. J. & O. B.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7	2,820.00	1.19	8	3,250.00	1.12	2	1,956.40	2.68
St. Louis, K. & N-W.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	2	1,945.00	1.85	1	1,285.00	3.52	2	1,214.49	1.67	10	5,400.00	1.48	2	840.00	1.15	1	2,434.08	3.42
Chicago Great Western.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	6	2,652.29	1.22	.....	.....	.....	1	832.88	2.21
Chicago, Mt. M. & D. M.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	80	54,540.00	1.88	110	55,438.00	1.38	85	111,690.00	3.60
Chicago, Rock I. & Pac.	10	72,922.28	20.65	15	58,691.44	10.43	90	62,184.04	2.21	271	146,563.30	1.73	843	401,518.42	1.52	287	335,549.28	3.73
Chicago & North-West'n	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	168	98,668.40	1.88	215	98,647.20	1.47	143	197,116.92	4.40
Chicago, St. P. M. & O	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	159	119,167.80	1.85	329	149,116.79	1.59	402	433,484.25	3.67
St. Paul & Northern P.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12	9,079.33	2.42	41	22,549.09	1.76	17	22,076.77	4.15
St. Paul & Northern P.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	13	9,720.00	2.39	50	27,173.88	1.85	18	21,767.19	3.86
St. Paul & Northern P.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	811.35	1.30	.....	.....	.....	1	879.00	2.44
Crooked Creek.....	3	3,080.00	3.29	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,484.40	1.92	29	15,683.84	1.56	.....	.....	.....	9	12,170.72	4.32
Des Moines, N. & W.	6	8,220.00	7.47	1	900.00	4.89	20	52,502.88	2.19	96	56,647.89	1.63	119	46,143.51	1.34	91	101,318.92	3.72
Dubuque & Sioux City...	10	60,690.46	10.23	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8	960.00	1.32	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Stacyville railroad.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Des Moines Union.....	2	3,100.00	4.25	.....	.....	.....	4	1,350.00	1.08	.....	.....	.....	28	16,524.10	1.49	3	2,488.24	2.45
Iowa Central.....	15	34,788.14	6.36	.....	.....	.....	62	33,041.42	1.65	71	35,144.80	1.42	34	14,043.73	1.09	59	70,925.00	3.75
Albia & Centerville.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	1,200.00	1.64	2	159.96	.22	.....	.....	.....
Iowa Northern.....	1	300.00	2.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	580.00	2.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kokuk & Western.....	5	12,094.51	5.49	7	13,900.00	5.28	20	1,183.18	1.45	32	15,238.70	1.37	26	12,555.68	1.35	16	16,050.49	3.41
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,234.00	1.59	12	6,331.01	1.45	1	280.11	.72	3	4,000.20	3.60
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	15	11,118.49	13.35	5	1,261.30	4.21	59	6,592.26	2.17	19	11,760.00	1.98	8	2,361.96	1.08	17	17,116.72	3.61
Muscatine N. & S. F.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	594.45	1.78	5	1,445.15	1.74	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Omaha & St. Louis.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10	5,696.88	1.62	12	5,111.64	1.52	9	8,289.17	3.06
St. Paul & Northern P.	4	9,100.00	6.23	8	6,660.00	3.96	15	9,237.40	2.12	14	7,597.55	1.66	18	7,064.70	1.32	6	7,294.10	3.52
Tabor & Northern.....	1	.....	.....	1	1,200.00	3.83	.....	.....	.....	1	4.00	1.53	1	90.00	.28	1	720.00	.....
Union Pacific.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wabash.....	1	3,316.17	14.35	.....	.....	.....	6	4,979.06	2.64	7	4,305.47	1.85	17	8,844.27	1.63	9	11,283.63	3.99
Winona & Western.....	4	1,038.76	3.54	3	697.54	3.11	1	99.65	1.33	3	1,641.46	1.52	1	446.49	1.39	5	1,153.02	3.67
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.																		
Burlington & Northw'n.	8	2,161.40	4.61	2	916.05	2.93	6	1,334.60	1.42	8	3,421.50	1.37	3	836.55	.86	2	1,884.70	3.01
Burlington & Western.....	3	2,458.00	5.23	2	1,033.55	3.30	6	1,499.10	1.60	14	5,341.90	1.22	3	1,182.85	1.20	4	4,464.00	3.57
Total.....	129	\$358,805.48	.....	137	\$194,574.83	.....	436	\$397,236.80	.....	1,370	\$800,177.30	.....	2,402	\$1,097,100.64	.....	1,560	\$1,828,731.04	.....

\* Six months. † Five and one-third months.



TABLE 44—EMPLOYES AND SALARIES—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	FIREMEN.			CONDUCTORS.			OTHER TRAINMEN.			MACHINISTS.			CARPENTERS.			OTHER SHOPMEN.		
	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.
Ames & College.....	1	\$ 483.00	\$1.31	1	\$ 560.00	\$1.54	1	\$ 20.41	\$0.02	1	\$ 34,005.00	\$2.55	40	\$ 18,596.40	\$2.11	276	\$ 114,994.80	\$1.61
Atch., Topeka & S. Fe..	58	43,322.44	2.23	18	19,697.64	3.38	38	20,418.36	\$0.02	57	34,005.00	\$2.55	40	18,596.40	\$2.11	276	114,994.80	\$1.61
Boone Valley.....	1	427.50	2.25	1	510.50	3.00	1	1,020.00	2.00	1	71,035.00	2.46	160	92,052.45	2.05	343	155,405.70	1.46
Bur., Ced Rapids & N..	110	79,162.00	2.30	76	79,770.52	1.32	163	100,111.73	1.93	115	71,035.00	2.46	160	92,052.45	2.05	343	155,405.70	1.46
O. Rap., Garner & N.-W.	1	427.50	2.25	1	510.50	3.00	1	1,020.00	2.00	1	71,035.00	2.46	160	92,052.45	2.05	343	155,405.70	1.46
Chicago, Bur. & Quincy	197	133,027.68	1.86	129	140,620.77	2.98	274	165,022.69	1.84	226	143,441.35	2.02	246	154,779.05	2.01	858	405,416.45	1.51
Chicago, Bur. & K. C.	13	8,856.48	1.89	11	12,314.64	3.21	21	14,291.40	1.83	1	71,035.00	2.46	160	92,052.45	2.05	343	155,405.70	1.46
K. C., St. Joe & C. B.	2	772.80	1.50	1	780.00	2.49	2	1,320.86	2.11	9	5,442.72	1.93	5	2,970.60	1.90	20	9,468.60	1.51
St. L., Keokuk & N.-W.	2	1,043.90	1.43	1	1,821.40	2.78	3	2,031.54	1.89	2	1,200.15	2.12	2	1,102.65	1.75	5	2,475.35	1.52
Chicago, Ft. M. & D. M.	1	432.04	1.18	1	672.58	1.84	2	1,098.72	1.39	1	791.50	2.16	1	672.00	2.15	21	11,429.88	1.74
Chicago, Iowa & Dak.	85	68,255.00	2.20	57	60,014.25	2.86	135	73,912.00	1.50	33	28,123.25	2.30	92	62,460.62	1.85	162	138,700.00	2.50
Chicago Great Western	238	202,157.38	2.26	236	280,939.15	3.54	364	237,122.98	2.08	97	75,533.85	2.48	187	113,245.56	1.93	559	303,389.36	1.73
Chicago, Mil. & St. Paul	141	122,888.40	2.78	105	122,531.52	3.73	192	138,433.08	2.20	31	24,493.80	2.52	146	92,252.64	2.02	424	207,155.28	1.56
Chicago, R. I. & Pacific	449	294,733.71	2.19	265	276,720.96	2.23	518	342,689.03	2.00	204	123,826.25	1.94	271	139,087.68	2.16	619	291,583.79	1.45
Chicago & N.-Western	17	13,512.89	2.54	13	13,659.24	3.36	30	19,457.61	2.07	55	33,423.99	1.97	40	24,746.34	1.98	7	7,774.96	3.55
O. St. P., Minn. & O.	18	13,205.62	2.34	6	7,762.76	4.13	15	10,519.22	2.10	86	50,659.21	1.84	117	49,073.87	1.62	203	99,934.27	1.64
Sioux City & Pacific	1	540.00	1.73	1	540.00	1.73	1	540.00	1.73	1	540.00	1.73	1	540.00	1.73	1	480.00	1.58
Crooked Creek.....	9	7,551.65	2.68	8	8,262.30	3.30	12	6,472.89	1.72	10	6,391.08	1.99	6	4,156.89	2.30	24	15,021.09	1.75
D. M. Nor. & Western	95	59,783.32	2.20	56	61,456.21	3.58	116	82,169.74	2.15	108	50,080.38	1.63	52	42,881.08	2.23	150	74,836.71	1.63
Dubuque & Sioux City..	3	1,616.00	2.07	39	39,728.59	2.93	73	47,361.09	1.93	102	33,987.20	1.91	71	32,657.28	2.02	111	46,933.80	1.62
Stacyville railroad.....	64	39,093.03	2.07	39	39,728.59	2.93	73	47,361.09	1.93	102	33,987.20	1.91	71	32,657.28	2.02	111	46,933.80	1.62
Des Moines Union.....	1	540.00	1.80	1	600.00	2.00	2	960.00	1.60	1	9,065.42	2.47	7	3,016.00	2.08	25	7,707.42	1.36
Iowa Central.....	18	10,042.29	2.09	11	10,124.12	3.08	22	9,931.84	1.70	21	9,882.05	1.51	17	9,356.66	2.20	97	39,011.35	1.41
Albia & Centerville.....	3	2,598.16	2.35	3	2,865.44	2.58	4	2,723.85	2.01	3	3,057.63	2.82	14	6,530.86	1.99	17	8,353.41	1.56
Iowa Northern.....	17	9,914.52	2.09	7	6,099.60	2.81	16	9,339.36	2.11	4	3,118.92	2.52	6	3,730.40	3.17	29	10,825.68	1.43
Keokuk & Western.....	3	498.28	2.17	3	635.20	2.83	6	982.38	1.62	1	261.46	2.09	1	261.46	2.09	3	693.66	1.49
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	9	5,178.03	1.87	7	3,478.50	2.25	18	4,904.84	1.64	6	5,229.25	2.60	10	8,223.90	2.33	68	30,614.35	1.93
Minneapolis & St. Louis	6	4,508.15	2.18	5	4,879.95	3.31	11	5,401.70	2.10	6	5,229.25	2.60	10	8,223.90	2.33	68	30,614.35	1.93
Muscatine Nor. & South	1	420.00	1.34	1	420.00	1.34	1	420.00	1.34	1	420.00	1.34	1	420.00	1.34	1	420.00	1.34
Omaha & St. Louis.....	9	6,507.19	2.29	6	7,069.48	3.56	12	8,285.94	2.18	10	6,391.08	1.99	6	4,156.89	2.30	24	15,021.09	1.75
Sioux City & Northern	5	652.34	2.01	8	766.34	3.31	6	693.03	1.66	2	252.19	2.27	10	765.89	2.05	9	987.61	1.50
Tabor & Northern.....	2	1,429.35	2.28	1	804.70	2.57	1	750.85	2.40	4	3,643.45	2.91	6	4,141.45	2.21	15	7,733.80	1.65
Union Pacific.....	4	2,812.40	2.25	4	3,403.00	2.72	8	4,218.50	1.68	2	252.19	2.27	10	765.89	2.05	9	987.61	1.50
Wabash.....	2	1,429.35	2.28	1	804.70	2.57	1	750.85	2.40	4	3,643.45	2.91	6	4,141.45	2.21	15	7,733.80	1.65
Winona & Western.....	4	2,812.40	2.25	4	3,403.00	2.72	8	4,218.50	1.68	2	252.19	2.27	10	765.89	2.05	9	987.61	1.50
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.																		
Bur. & Northwestern.....	1,632	\$1,137,048.15	.....	1,078	\$1,149,521.36	.....	2,062	\$1,311,556.23	.....	1,194	\$718,005.04	.....	1,524	\$871,133.42	.....	4,048	\$1,988,245.79	.....
Burlington & Western..																		
Total.....																		

TABLE 45—EMPLOYES AND SALARIES—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS,	SECTION FOREMEN.			OTHER TRACKMEN.			SWITCHMEN, FLAG-MEN AND WATCHMEN.			TELEGRAPHERS AND DESPATCHERS.			EMPLOYEES ACCOUNTS AND EQUIPMENT.			ALL OTHER EMPLOYEES AND LABORERS.		
	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Av.daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Av.daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Av.daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Av.daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Av.daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Av.daily compensation.
Ames & College.....	1	\$ 483.00	\$1.31			\$1.31										1	\$ 240.00	\$ .65
Atchison, Topeka & Santa F.	5	2,760.00	1.53	53	13,874.04	1.26	11	9,164.16	\$2.94	7	2,791.92	\$1.59				124	44,885.24	1.69
Boone Valley.....																		
Burlington, Cedar R. & Nor.	163	89,242.50	1.50	679	265,658.75	1.25	80	51,010.84	2.15	78	41,434.32	1.70				157	102,709.91	
Cedar Rapids, Gar. & N.-W.	9	892.50	1.50		2,295.00													
Chicago, Burlington & Q.	178	91,802.31	1.41	772	291,473.66	1.21	196	117,321.01	1.64	106	73,087.20					224	110,839.50	1.58
Chicago, Burlington & K. O.	15	7,200.00	1.32	63	21,274.80	1.10	1	660.00	2.11	3	8,060.00	2.79				5	3,402.00	2.17
Kansas City, St. Jo. & O. B.	12	6,204.00	1.42	65	22,021.80	1.08	2	1,200.00	1.64	3	1,159.92	1.06				8	3,435.00	2.17
St. Louis, Keokuk & N.-W.	9	4,380.00	1.33	47	15,891.80	1.05	3	2,039.20	2.59	2	1,140.00	1.50				5	8,426.12	2.19
Chicago, Ft. Mad. & Des M.	10	5,520.00	1.51	30	12,215.62	1.25	1	81.12	2.21	1	600.00	1.61						
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.	3	1,350.00	1.23	10	3,196.22	1.02												
Chicago Great Western	73	41,016.87	1.55	480	186,525.76	1.24	42	37,381.12	2.49	45	30,386.25	1.85				190	125,404.75	1.80
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. P.	287	156,405.57	1.74	1,148	445,887.44	1.21	335	211,160.54	2.01	255	168,297.70	2.11				1,267	902,855.56	2.28
Chicago, Rock Island & Pac.	191	110,730.00	1.85	982	311,084.55	1.26	125	81,400.92	2.08	86	60,300.00	2.24				140	99,957.48	2.28
Chicago & North-Western	202	124,697.80	1.76	1,705	444,450.81	1.31	256	175,133.48	2.25	224	135,677.21	1.93				716	298,947.96	1.77
Chicago, St. Paul, M. & O.	13	7,196.25	1.77	33	13,516.66	1.31	18	11,969.02	2.13	11	6,812.54	1.98				41	23,314.90	1.74
Sioux City & Pacific.....	14	7,200.00	1.64	51	15,468.28	1.24	31	20,800.81	2.14	6	3,180.00	1.69				10	2,544.83	1.81
Crooked Creek.....	2	960.00	1.54	4	1,045.82	1.25							2	804.31	\$1.50			
Des Moines, North'n & West.	25	13,500.00	1.48	99	35,932.05	1.19				8	4,456.68	1.53				5	1,768.80	1.10
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	100	50,259.23	1.63	550	110,291.00	1.14	67	39,564.57	1.82	52	32,658.11	1.81				266	154,817.05	1.75
Stacyville railroad.....	1	480.00	1.53	3	687.97	1.10												
Des Moines Union.....	2	1,380.00	1.59	18	8,997.95	1.27	25	13,876.00	1.75	2	900.00	1.64				24	8,182.04	1.42
Iowa Central.....	61	31,271.00	1.35	378	82,735.75	1.19	41	23,794.65	2.00	31	17,678.59	1.58	6	10,965.55	1.98	69	40,787.99	1.57
Albia & Centerville.....	4	2,080.00	1.42	29	4,810.30	1.21				1	420.00	1.14				1	463.50	1.20
Iowa Northern.....	1	480.00	1.60	5	2,250.00	1.50												
Keokuk & Western.....	34	18,719.90	1.50	181	31,357.94	1.15	10	4,767.93	1.65	21	6,495.58	1.19				7	3,646.65	1.31
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	14	6,942.58	1.39	37	10,316.04	1.13				2	777.61	1.36				12	4,310.89	2.00
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	27	14,580.00	1.73	37	12,129.08	1.01	3	2,160.00	2.30	7	2,840.00	1.30				13	9,872.70	2.50
Muscataine North & South.....	4	592.10	1.21	15	1,401.86	1.21				1	292.50	1.80						
Omaha & St. Louis.....	12	5,823.60	1.31	55	14,624.50	1.11	5	2,700.00	1.45	9	2,343.72	1.40				15	5,228.60	2.08
Sioux City & Northern.....	12	6,427.35	1.71	62	9,828.45	1.27	12	5,364.05	1.60	4	1,895.55	1.71				20	7,433.85	1.56
Tabor & Northern.....	1	450.00	1.44	4	1,377.20	1.10												
Union Pacific.....																		
Wabash.....	7	3,675.10	1.78	25	9,419.35	1.18	10	6,152.37	2.06	5	3,365.28	2.06				14	10,428.78	2.42
Winona & Western.....	3	1,630.00	1.51	8	2,019.99	1.25				1	207.59	2.78	2	1,371.30	1.84	2	274.03	1.83
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.																		
Burlington & North-western.	7	3,860.00	1.76	14	5,185.15	1.18	2	1,352.45	2.16	2	805.60	2.57				8	4,794.75	1.91
Burlington & Western.....	12	6,060.00	1.61	23	8,059.58	1.12	1	571.55	1.63	2	914.40	2.92				6	2,169.25	1.16
Total.....	1,514	\$826,548.66		7,684	\$3,416,805.44		1,280	\$819,645.79		975	\$603,978.34		10	\$12,941.16		3,350	\$1,974,344.15	



TABLE 46—EMPLOYES AND SALARIES—

RAILROADS.	IOWA.					
	TOTAL, INCLUDING GENERAL OFFICERS.			TOTAL, EXCLUDING GENERAL OFFICERS.		
	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.
Ames & College.....	4	1,754.80		4	1,754.80	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	750	409,152.96	\$ 2.07	750	409,152.96	\$ 2.07
Boone Valley.....						
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northwestern.....	2,725	1,683,161.18	1.87	2,714	1,544,353.04	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	28	9,972.00		25	7,982.50	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	4,115	2,888,893.11	1.75	4,099	2,909,901.57	1.70
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....	162	95,142.50	1.72	162	95,142.50	1.72
Kansas City, St. Joe & Council Bluffs.....	125	52,571.40	1.31	125	52,571.40	1.31
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....	122	55,420.20	1.41	122	55,420.20	1.41
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	78	45,207.14	1.59	75	39,876.90	1.56
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	30	13,125.05	1.25	28	11,780.05	1.21
Chicago Great Western.....	1,661	1,079,857.87	1.85	1,661	1,079,857.87	1.85
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	6,537	4,153,333.84	2.03	6,529	4,080,411.56	2.00
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	3,094	1,781,888.19	1.96	3,094	1,781,888.19	1.96
Chicago & North-Western.....	6,333	3,362,993.81	1.96	6,333	3,362,993.81	1.96
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	348	328,624.59	2.10	348	328,624.59	2.10
Sioux City & Pacific.....	640	330,639.96	1.82	639	330,549.96	1.82
Crooked Creek.....	18	9,480.48	1.88	15	6,400.48	1.58
Des Moines Northern & Western.....	230	124,246.28	1.72	224	115,996.28	1.63
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	1,944	1,076,000.51	1.91	1,934	1,018,310.05	1.82
Stacyville railroad.....	6	2,127.97	1.28	6	2,127.97	1.28
Des Moines Union.....	162	78,203.17	1.61	160	75,103.17	1.57
Iowa Central.....	1,287	634,919.61	1.83	1,272	600,151.47	1.75
Albia & Centerville.....	46	10,166.16	1.25	46	10,166.16	1.25
Iowa Northern.....	13	6,970.00		12	6,370.00	
Keokuk & Western.....	549	228,901.17	1.07	543	213,866.56	1.61
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	136	67,304.29	1.72	136	61,411.79	1.64
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	309	134,922.99	2.05	294	123,804.50	1.90
Muscatine North & South.....	50	9,791.84	1.78	48	8,681.84	1.68
Omaha & St. Louis.....	161	63,379.48	1.59	161	63,379.48	1.59
Sioux City & Northern.....	270	137,000.20	2.02	275	127,900.20	1.93
Tabor & Northern.....	12	6,157.20	1.37	10	3,957.20	1.26
Union Pacific.....						
Wabash.....	168	111,231.13	2.11	167	107,914.96	2.02
Winona & Western.....	68	14,749.23	1.81	64	13,690.47	1.77
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.						
Burlington & Northwestern.....	86	45,056.35	1.81	83	42,804.95	1.76
Burlington & Western.....	100	48,957.20	1.67	97	46,497.60	1.61
Total.....	32,385	\$18,408,383.76		32,245	\$18,046,376.73	

IOWA CONTINUED AND ENTIRE LINE.

DISTRIBUTION.	IOWA.						ENTIRE LINE.					
	TOTAL, INCLUDING GENERAL OFFICERS.			TOTAL, EXCLUDING GENERAL OFFICERS.			TOTAL, INCLUDING GENERAL OFFICERS.			TOTAL, EXCLUDING GENERAL OFFICERS.		
	General administration.	Maintenance of way and structure.	Maintenance of equipment.	Conducting transportation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.	Average daily compensation.	Number.	Total yearly compensation.
	\$ 17,139.84	\$ 48,141.24	\$ 167,596.20	\$ 176,275.98	17,068	\$10,085,946.48	\$ 2.11	17,814	\$ 9,726,057.86	\$ 2.04		
	84,062.84	477,705.28	492,360.70	529,002.31	3,036	1,744,403.94	1.83	3,025	1,783,212.03			
	125,281.15	575,001.52	585,804.50	1,102,806.14	28	9,971.50		25	7,982.50			
		28,474.80	600.00	66,067.80	22,143	12,965,768.34	1.77	22,003	12,478,648.72	1.72		
		25,235.80	13,101.88	12,243.72	329	199,243.78	1.58	328	195,414.78	1.55		
		19,771.80	17,881.92	17,766.48	1,793	1,090,442.70	1.77	1,784	1,039,473.75	1.73		
	7,829.73	17,735.62	4,778.15	14,863.04	1,593	868,081.96	1.62	1,588	847,839.91	1.58		
	1,345.00	4,546.22	1,008.72	6,125.11	78	45,207.14	1.59	75	39,876.90	1.56		
	6,000.00	273,941.89	253,110.77	546,803.21	30	13,125.05	1.25	28	11,780.05	1.21		
	193,797.76	1,014,365.74	585,983.53	2,359,286.81	3,492	2,246,437.36	1.91	3,481	2,287,436.96	1.87		
	16,800.00	463,915.71	323,931.72	977,240.76	21,622	13,739,112.92	2.03	21,594	13,497,888.05	2.00		
	2,707.98	928,677.18	264,148.92	2,167,459.73	11,970	7,327,622.32	2.06	11,947	7,181,822.44	2.03		
					28,696	15,236,750.92	1.98	28,674	15,075,451.12	1.95		
					4,884	3,281,858.10	2.13	4,857	3,154,557.97	2.06		
	90.00	31,721.37	162,505.55	145,323.04	711	367,236.22	1.78	695	362,510.26	1.80		
	3,080.00	2,005.82	540.00	3,854.66	18	9,480.48	1.88	15	6,400.48	1.58		
	11,634.40	56,240.95	56,371.86	230	124,246.28	1.72	234	115,996.28	1.63			
	52,598.46	268,384.38	203,059.74	551,957.98	2,061	1,097,271.51	1.90	2,041	1,036,581.05	1.81		
		1,167.97		960.00	6	2,127.97	1.28	6	2,127.97	1.28		
	4,450.00	11,308.17	10,375.26	53,172.94	162	78,203.17	1.61	160	75,103.17	1.57		
	67,809.56	159,561.22	119,776.35	237,771.48	1,549	785,213.68	1.80	1,538	755,833.84	1.75		
		8,386.20		1,779.96	46	10,166.16	1.25	46	10,166.16	1.25		
	1,180.00	2,730.00		3,060.00	13	6,920.00		12	6,370.00			
	34,717.59	55,402.82	47,571.73	85,308.63	688	281,876.56	1.65	682	269,811.75	1.60		
	15,206.50	25,361.68	13,351.73	67,291.29	136	67,291.29	1.72	129	61,111.79	1.64		
	20,452.95	29,770.89	19,165.91	65,543.24	1,780	839,197.15	2.07	1,745	779,039.10	1.92		
	1,704.45	165.50	261.46	7,690.43	50	9,791.84	1.78	48	8,681.84	1.68		
		25,676.00		37,705.78	488	129,138.44	1.59	488	129,138.44	1.59		
	24,987.40	24,479.70	85,843.60	61,779.60	275	137,000.20	2.02	275	127,900.20	1.93		
	1,300.00	1,827.20		2,130.00	12	5,157.20	1.37	10	3,957.20	1.26		
	7,985.27	18,236.37	23,762.74	61,246.75	8,431	5,561,556.50	2.11	8,394	5,395,748.12	2.05		
	1,158.41	5,154.94	2,843.61	5,592.27	144	74,320.00	1.77	140	69,220.00	1.71		
	1,412.05	11,285.70	15,518.70	13,839.90	86	45,066.35	1.81	83	42,804.95	1.76		
	4,991.25	21,157.35		22,908.60	100	48,957.20	1.67	97	46,497.60	1.61		
	\$ 102,652.39	\$ 4,643,924.10	\$ 3,363,003.19	\$ 4,452,601.74	134,326	\$78,667,701.33		123,849	\$76,753,193.80			



TABLE 47—BRIDGES, TRESTLES, HIGHWAY, RAILWAY AND FARM CROSSINGS AND CATTLE GUARDS.

RAILROADS.	BRIDGES.					TRETTLES.		HIGHWAY CROSSINGS.		FARM CROSSINGS.		OVERHEAD RAILWAY CROSSINGS.	
	STONE.	STEEL OR IRON.	WOODEN.	COMBINATION.	Total number.	Total aggregate length.	Number.	Aggregate length.	Overhead.	As grade.	Below grade.	Number of cattle guards.	Bridges.
	Number.	Aggregate length.	Number.	Aggregate length.	Number.	Aggregate length.	Number.	Aggregate length.	Overhead.	As grade.	Below grade.	Number of cattle guards.	Conduits.
Ames & College													
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe		4	44	6	2,235	10	2,279	16	2,236	1	17	2	17
Boone Valley													
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern	168	11,887	49	382	5,818	15	15,637	531	43,406	1	2,336	17	1,450
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern			11	244		11	244						
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	172	13,608	872	57,524	905	1,052	102,337	3	2,321	88	61	114	188
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City			1	135		1	135						
K. O. St. Joe & Council Bluffs	1	30		593		3	165	79	3,791	1	51	2	88
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern				2,400		2	2,400	66	8,804	1	103		
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines													
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota		8	252	19	778	1	154	23	1,184				
Chicago Great Western		21	4,404	1	800		25	4,709	696	1	11	838	10
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	137	14,792	47	8,615	1,400	198	23,811	2,338	160,291	1	27	38	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	225	22,800	47	3,136	2,436	294	29,463	941	67,127	10	201	1,001	50
Chicago & North-Western	58	1,611	239	15,022	1,033	406	15,022	355	67,241	2	11	385	1,435
Chl. St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha			1	60		3	240	127	9,900	1	2	99	17
Sioux City & Pacific					3	420	3	420	59	4,742			
Crooked Creek				850		3	850						
Des Moines Northern & Western		6	600	1			9	900	10	12,350			
Dubuque & Sioux City	33	7,372	6	1,428		41	8,800	672	54,591	5	721	9	277
Stacyville railroad													
Des Moines Union													
Iowa Central	20	5,163	3	788		23	5,951	572	48,145	3	400	9	830
Albia & Centerville					1	100		30	30				
Iowa Northern													
Keokuk & Western	1	954	2	268	1,375	4	1,597	387	27,758	3	229	3	17
Mason City & Ft. Dodge				539			850	97	7,233	1			
Minneapolis & St. Louis	3	293		3	357	0	579	102	9,747	1			
Muscatine North & South	1	900				1	900	28	5,167				
Omaha & St. Louis			114	19,122		13	11,731	18	51,731				
Sioux City & Northern			114	19,122		13	11,731	18	51,731				
Tabor & Northern	1	136	12	1,056		13	1,184	0	2,406				
Union Pacific													
Wabash	1	657	5	1,312		1	1,850	251	20,452				
Winona & Western			1	76		1	76						
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.													
Burlington & Northwestern		1	60			1	80						
Burlington & Western		3	522			3	522	39	7,108				
Total	53	1,511	1,037	101,205	1,352	135,373	11,433	2,401,350	819,833	721,064	85	132	7,710

TABLE 48—STATIONS—RENEWALS OF RAILS AND TIES.

RAILROADS.	STATIONS.				NEW RAILS LAID DURING YEAR IN IOWA.				NEW TIES LAID DURING YEAR IN IOWA.			
	ON ROAD OWNED.		ON ROAD OPERATED.		IRON.		STEEL.		Number.		Average price per ton at 1910 prices.	
	Entire line.	In Iowa.	Entire line.	In Iowa.	Tons.	Weight per yard-lbs.	Tons.	Weight per yard-lbs.	Number.	Weight per yard-lbs.	Number.	Weight per yard-lbs.
Ames & College	890	3	890	3			5,303.60	75	830.75	6,776		45
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe							6,181.54	80	19.05	203,969		45
Boone Valley	79	7	158	174			10,614.50	75	83.00	271,820		45
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern	34	16	38	29			10,614.50	75	83.00	20,061		38
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern	903	149	903	149	145		10,614.50	75	10.85	10,398		45
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	34	16	38	29			10,614.50	75	10.85	18,417		37
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City	55	10	55	10			10,614.50	75	10.85	28,078		34
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs	41	14	43	15			10,614.50	75	10.85	1,630		34
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern	18	19	19	19			10,614.50	75	10.85			
Chicago, Fort Madison & Des Moines	6	6	6	6			1,490.93	75	21.00			
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	174	84	195	85								
Chicago Great Western	430	132	476	169	150		1,118.75	80	18.00	303,862		45
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	667	105	814	198	191		10,136.00	86	15.00	336,311		45
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	273	20	260	30	19					12,506		44
Chicago & North-Western	16	12	16	12			49.90	60	12.75	1,283		30
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	5	5	5	5						505		37
Sioux City & Pacific	5	5	5	5						16,320		33
Crooked Creek	121	113	121	113	99		3,618.00	85	18.00	151,854		35
Des Moines Northern & Western	2	2	2	2						4,564		55
Dubuque & Sioux City	2	2	2	2			2,471.00	70	16.97	185,080		41
Stacyville railroad										11,440		53
Des Moines Union	3	3	3	3						760		57
Iowa Central	45	28	46	29	25		23.40	60	19.60	71,238		30
Albia & Centerville	18	18	18	18						22,319		41
Iowa Northern	91	9	9	9						5,000		60
Keokuk & Western	5	5	5	5						10,093		44
Mason City & Fort Dodge	31	15	25	14	10							
Minneapolis & St. Louis	16	12	16	12			176.00	56	18.00			
Muscatine North & South	3	3	3	3								
Omaha & St. Louis	16	12	16	12								
Sioux City & Northern	32	10	32	10								
Tabor & Northern	19	4	19	4								
Union Pacific	8	8	8	8			42.50	52	13.45	6,310		31
Wabash	14	14	14	14			366.50	52	13.33	12,611		31
Winona & Western												
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.												
Burlington & Northwestern												
Burlington & Western												
Total	4,408	1,007	4,880	1,358	1,061		43,277.18			1,777,964		



TABLE 49—DESCRIPTION OF EQUIPMENT.

RAILROADS.	LOCOMOTIVES.				CARS IN PASSENGER SERVICE.										CARS IN FREIGHT SERVICE.										EQUIPPED WITH—			
	Passenger.	Freight.	Switching.	Leased.	Total.	First-class passenger cars.	Second-class passenger cars.	Combination.	Emigrant.	Dining.	Parlor.	Sleeping.	Baggage, express and postal.	Other cars.	Total.	EQUIP'D WITH—		Box.	Flat.	Stock.	Coal.	Tank.	Refrigerator.	Other.	Total.	Train brake.	Automatic couplers.	
																Train brake.	Automatic couplers.											
Ames & College	2				2										3	3												
Atchison, T. & S. F.	308	308	178		884	257	43	57	1				147		521	521	521	11,354	1,547	2,733	7,079	1,036	578	24,333	23,392	20,134		
Boone Valley		40	79	8	127	34	12	16					22		87	87	87	3,003	424	349	178	76	498	5,128	2,176	4,819		
B. O. R. & N.															1	1												
C. R. G. & N.-W.	110	375	128		613	338	28	33					136		527	527	527	18,207	1,414	2,864	3,846	356		26,687	11,997	25,594		
C. B. & K. Cy.	12	15	17		44	13	6	12					13		39	39	39	820	64	82	102			1,068	480	918		
K. Cy., St. Jo. & C. B.	10	16	1		27	3	4	1					11		28	28	28	284	94	100	54	30	10	572	224	513		
St. L., K. & N.-W.	1	2			3	1									3	3	3	18		5	10			33	33	33		
C. Ft. M. & D. M.	1	1			2										2	2	2	10		5	10			17	17	17		
C. I. & D.	212	486	115		813	173	217	14					22		90	90	90	4,544	255	386	333	11	242	5,771	3,788	4,437		
C. G. W.	152	637	135		1,010	483	44	115					193		772	772	759	24,676	6,162	2,726				33,524	23,761	33,038		
C. M. & St. P.	58	171	40		269	78	17	25					71		201	201	201	7,104	1,134	393	932	85	127	9,775	7,991	8,745		
C. & N.-W.	218	657	135		1,010	483	44	115					193		772	772	759	24,676	6,162	2,726	1,010	171	38	16,008	27,730	15,830		
C. St. P., M. & O.	5	5	2		12	5	5	5					3		13	13	13	390	46	20				356	315	356		
Sioux City & Pacific	1	1			2										1	1	1	2						30	100	170		
Crooked Creek	1	1			2										1	1	1	2						30	100	170		
Des M., N. & W.	4	4			8										4	4	4	16						40	160	240		
Dubuque & Sioux City	17	30	8		55	28	8	9					17		45	45	45	137	24	24	14			199	199	199		
Stacyville railroad																												
Des Moines Union																												
Iowa Central	18	46	7		71	20	6	2					9		37	37	37	1,451	748	117				2,316	1,840	2,150		
Albia & Centerville																												
Iowa Northern			1		1			1							1	1												
Keokuk & Western	8	11	2		21	6	5	2					4		17	17	17	556	11	155	178			900	571	750		
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	1	4	1		6	1	2	2					2		7	7	7	37		5	165			197	144	183		
Minneapolis & St. Louis	21	33	14		68	18	17	9					11		55	55	55	2,378	462	78	58	4	27	3,007	1,311	2,954		
Muscatine North & South		3			3	1		1					2		2	2	2	2							500	442	442	
Omaha & St. Louis	7	6	4		17	3		2					4		10	9	9	458	16	21	5			467	283	283		
Sioux City & Northern	7	2	2		11	4		2					3		9	9	9	219	77	98	23			467	283	283		
Tabor & Northern	1	1			2								1		2	2	2	2							4	4	4	
Union Pacific	114	218	72		404	74	50	41					107		332	332	332	7,537	834	4,307	100	17		12,795	5,834	11,354		
Wabash	1	4	1		6			2					6		6	6	6	200	84					294	102	191		
Winona & Western																												
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.																												
Burlington & N.-W.	1	2	1		4			1					2		3	3	3	97		4	6			108				
Burlington & Western	1	3			4			1					2		3	3	3	108		22	78			241				
Total	1,332	2,976	860	67	5,235	1,729	524	415	3	64	146	53	1,175	54	114	4,080	4,084	114,580	17,898	16,321	23,079	3,279	6,194	181,351	120,055	170,818		

\*All engines owned.

TABLE 50—DESCRIPTION OF EQUIPMENT—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	CARS IN COMPANY'S SERVICE.						CARS IN FAST FREIGHT SERVICE.				CARS LEASED.				GR'D TOTAL.	
	Gravel.	Derrick.	Oaboose.	Other road cars.	Total.	EQUIPPED WITH—	Number.	Train brake.	Auto-matic coupler.	Total cars owned.	Number.	Train brake.	Auto-matic coupler.	Number of cars owned and leased.	Number of cars leased.	Total.
Ames & College										25,604				25,604		25,604
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	321	8	375	56	760	827	266			5,356				5,356		5,356
Boone Valley	27	3	70	41	141	1	108			27,604				27,604		27,604
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern										1,134				1,134		1,134
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern										643				643		643
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy										385				385		385
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City										3,405	2,963	2,455	2,706	6,368		6,368
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs										34,862				34,862		34,862
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern										17,258				17,258		17,258
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines										38,082				38,082		38,082
Chicago, Great Western	100	11	488	82	591	30	577			10,219				10,219		10,219
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul										385				385		385
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	468	32	546	61	627	63	623			33				33		33
Chicago & North-Western										256				256		256
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha										251				251		251
Sioux City & Pacific																
Crooked Creek																
Des Moines, Northern & Western																
Dubuque & Sioux City																
Stacyville railroad																
Des Moines Union																
Iowa Central																
Albia & Centerville																
Keokuk & Western	30	2	10	5	47	3	2			954				954		954
Mason City & Ft. Dodge										206				206		206
Minneapolis & St. Louis										3,141				3,141		3,141
Muscatine North & South										523				523		523
Omaha & St. Louis										483				483		483
Sioux City & Northern																
Tabor & Northern																
Union Pacific	300	8	220	265	793	4				13,920				13,920		13,920
Wabash										304				304		304
Winona & Western																
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.																
Burlington & Northwestern										118				118		118
Burlington & Western										249				249		249
Total	1,236	86	2,680	1,264	5,266	799	2,836	150		187,768	2,964	2,456	2,767	190,730	192,651	



TABLE 51—MILEAGE TRAFFIC—IOWA.

RAILROADS.	PASSENGER TRAFFIC.												EXP'NSE OF RUNNING AND MANAGEMENT OF PASSENGER TRAINS.	
	No. passengers carried earning revenue.	Number of passengers carried one mile.	Av. distance carried.	Total passenger revenue.	Amt. received from each passenger.	Av. receipts per passenger per mile—cents.	Total passenger earnings.	Passenger earnings per mile of road.	Passenger earnings per train mile.	Highest rate of fare per mile—cents.	Lowest rate of fare per mile—cents.	Cost of carrying each passenger one mile—cts.	Amt't.	Per tr. mile—cents.
Ames & College.....	666,812	1,98					\$ 3,334.11							
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....				\$ 23,425.78			33,119.74	\$ 1,667.66						
Boone Valley.....				548.75			548.75							
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	812,994	37,600,923	46.62	896,178.13	1.10	2.00	1,070,438.53	1,114.19	.90	3.50	2.00	2.201		
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	3,164	44,296	14.00	1,653.94	.52	3.50	1,653.94	59.07	1.73	3.50	3.50			
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....														
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....														
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.....														
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....														
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	28,440	625,680	22.00	15,405.95	.54	2.46	25,481.23	358.89	.56	3.00	1.33			
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....	19,203	268,842	14.00	5,828.66	.32	2.55	8,493.21	321.80	.79	4.00	2.00			
Chicago Great Western.....				512,595.27			615,915.37	1,323.55	.68	3.00	3.00			
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....				1,462,078.26			1,939,678.11	1,248.61	.99	3.00	1.00			
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	1,658,149	77,320,546	46.63	1,743,574.46	1.05	2.26	2,080,534.70	1,946.68	1.07					
Chicago & North-Western.....	1,671,567	90,606,950	54.32	1,986,759.78	1.19	2.19	2,424,314.47	2,078.83	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.363	\$2,145,589.92	88.51
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & O.....	146,675	7,461,505	50.87	171,689.23	1.17	2.30	211,199.93	2,069.57	1.33					
Sioux City & Pacific.....	214,794	8,861,150	41.25	194,705.88	.91	2.19	229,710.59	2,854.61	1.09	3.00	2.00	1.51	133,655.58	63.28
Crooked Creek.....				702.01			1,410.81	80.11						
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....	194,974	5,069,342	26.00	111,241.09	.57	2.19	135,961.54	913.17	.61	3.00	1.00			
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	686,934	27,448,631	41.16	662,261.96	.99	2.41	835,260.38	1,457.09	.89	3.00				
Stacyville railroad.....	3,287	21,558	6.56	531.63	.16	2.47	1,146.95	144.63	.22	3.00				
Des Moines Union.....														
Iowa Central.....	443,316	12,278,368	28.00	289,673.50	.65	2.36	354,365.23	849.52	.68	3.00	.58			
Albia & Centerville.....	19,022	313,985	16.00	8,064.14	.42	2.57	9,726.50	397.97	.32	3.00	1.04			
Iowa Northern.....	13,921	46,403	3.33	1,332.18	.10	3.00	1,392.18	200.89	.11	3.00	3.00			
Keokuk & Western.....	167,001	4,038,208	27.88	112,658.42	.67	2.42	139,183.58	792.66	.64					
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	66,639	1,182,963	21.10	32,638.12	.58	2.74	39,335.53	427.56	.80	4.00	2.00			
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	132,027	4,483,169	34.00	100,921.73	.76	2.25	138,841.71	995.21	.73					
Muscatine North & South.....	3,251	49,079	15.00	1,468.19	.45	2.98	1,657.97	57.83	.22	3.56	1.80			
Omaha & St. Louis.....	86,663	3,769,961	32.23	76,784.07	.88	2.04	97,624.98	286.23	.78	3.00	1.00		147,294.82	54
Sioux City & Northern.....	22,168	839,848	37.88	23,549.25	1.06	2.80	31,439.79	403.18	.63	3.00	2.00	6.75	19,531.82	38.91
Tabor & Northern.....				3,670.64			4,432.69	504.28						
Union Pacific.....														
Wabash.....	75,020	4,211,859	56.14	53,030.10	.71	1.25	74,410.29	596.71	.59					
Winona & Western.....	8,885	197,987	22.00	5,453.86	.61	2.75	7,358.66	313.13	.50	3.00	2.00			
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.														
Burlington & Northwestern.....	24,058	512,301	21.00	14,552.11	.60	2.84	19,437.10	370.23	1.36					
Burlington & Western.....	28,041	644,296	22.97	15,256.48	.54	2.37	21,807.68	209.29	.32					
Total.....	7,167,015	288,427,860		\$8,520,288.57			\$ 10,559,221.26						\$2,446,072.14	

TABLE 52—MILEAGE TRAFFIC—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	FREIGHT TRAFFIC.												EX. OF RUNNING AND MANAG'T OF FREIGHT TRAINS.		AVERAGE NO. TONS OF FREIGHT.		
	Number of tons carried earning revenue.	Number of tons carried one mile.	Average distance haul on one ton—miles.	Total freight revenue.	Average amount received for each ton of freight.	Average receipts per ton per mile—cents.	Total freight earnings.	Freight earnings per mile of road.	Freight earnings per train mile.	Percentage of freight from point to point in Iowa.	Amount.	Per train mile.	Av cost per ton per mile to move freight—cents.	In train.	In each loaded car.	In each car L. C. L.	
Ames & College.....				\$ 1,844.76			\$ 1,844.76										
Atchison, T. & S. F.....				84,427.38			84,730.46	\$ 4,266.39	\$ .91030								
Boone Valley.....				11,093.63			11,093.63										
Burl., Cedar R. & N.....	2,167,848	294,290,786	135.75	3,324,955.89	\$1.53375	1.129	3,224,955.86	3,460.86	2.05277	33.53							
Cedar R. G. & N.-W.....	21,679	303,506	14.00	14,659.79	.67600	2.57	14,659.79	1,017.13	.39607		\$ 4,379.20	\$46.					
Chi., Burl. & Quincy.....																	
C. B. & K. C.....																	
K. C., St. Jo & C.B.....																	
St. L. K. & N.-W.....																	
Chi., Ft. M. & D. M.....	34,902	1,681,578	48.18	57,379.67	1.64402	3.412	57,379.67	808.16	1.23392								
Chi., Iowa & Dakota.....	30,510	338,120	12.00	25,616.82	.83962	4.004	26,370.97	321.80	1.2180								
Chi. Great Western.....				2,298,576.25			2,298,576.25	4,939.45	1.762								
Chi. Mil. & St. Paul.....				7,592,088.67			7,592,088.67	4,887.18	1.38408								
Chi. R. I. & P.....	3,855,361	473,752,412	122.88	4,389,114.29	1.13844	.926	4,389,114.29	4,106.74	1.53046	21.88	3,711,687.75	68.5	.349	165.52	11.13		
Chicago & N.-W.....	4,663,257	1,064,379,031	228.00	7,618,639.29	1.63376	.969	7,619,781.87	6,533.91	1.40634								
Chi., St. P., M. & O.....	344,703	58,742,080	170.40	569,210.76	1.65131	.969	569,460.17	5,580.21	2.4082								
Sioux City & Pac.....	490,261	18,027,080	37.00	217,250.52	.44313	1.205	217,251.95	2,699.79	1.34312	4.52	122,159.87	75.54	.677	110.52	12.35		
Crooked Creek.....	18,656			10,154.19			10,154.19	576.61							87.50	12.50	
Des Moines N. & W.....	348,087	13,661,010	39.20	381,311.85	1.0954	2.79	381,311.85	2,561.03	2.4663						160.36	10.41	
Dubuque & Sioux O.....	1,138,211	185,403,037	162.89	2,086,812.21	1.83341	1.126	2,086,816.46	3,610.39	1.80496						18.83	4.19	
Stacyville R. R.....	13,699	93,721	6.84	6,062.64	.44256	6.469	6,062.64	764.52	1.21838								
Des Moines Union.....																	
Iowa Central.....	1,370,604	154,842,310	113.00	1,232,746.69	.89941	.731	1,232,746.69	2,965.31	1.42759								
Albia & Centerville.....	138,750	2,441,253	17.00	31,005.61	.22673	1.271	31,005.61	1,268.68	1.82500				4.47				
Iowa Northern.....	178,799	715,196	4.00	14,237.21	.28	1.99	14,267.21	200.89	1.42444	100.00							
Keokuk & Western.....	177,983	23,109,980	19.84	236,201.35	1.33238	1.022	236,201.35	1,345.18	1.45532						97.26	10.34	
Mason City & Ft. D.....	191,553	5,512,042	28.03	169,576.97	.88527	3.076	169,576.97	1,843.23	2.81.71						91.46	12.51	
Minneapolis & St. L.....	475,119	30,309,870	64.00	322,043.17	.67783	1.063	323,038.04	2,315.50	1.78769						167.74	12.07	
Muscatine N. & S.....	17,354	452,818	26.00	10,620.11	.61197	2.343	10,620.11	370.43	1.32685						80.00	16.00	
Omaha & St. Louis.....	138,826	14,993,703		124,164.04	.894	.82	124,164.04	1,674.45	1.18		142,446.60	52.			240.00	24.00	
Sioux City & North.....	253,523	13,658,399	53.87	222,017.03	.87573	1.626	223,193.03	2,862.18	3.8254	20.00	42,441.39	72.742	.739	234.10	13.70		
Tabor & Northern.....				8,778.09			8,761.03	996.70									
Union Pacific.....																	
Wabash.....	139,752	33,336,601	238.54	105,477.99	.75175	.316	105,477.99	845.85	.74267								
Winona & Western.....	25,393	1,371,212	54.00	30,304.09	1.19356	2.21	30,304.09	313.13	2.06080								
NARROW G. ROADS.																	
Burl. & N.-W.....	74,708	2,427,276	32.00	72,141.65	.95223	2.972	72,141.65	1,372.22	5.75337								
Burl. & Western.....	90,214	5,301,974	58.77	79,432.38	.88049	1.498	79,432.38	762.31	.8164								
Total.....	16,395,752	2,399,142,995		\$31,347,979.96			\$31,232,581.65										



TABLE 53—MILEAGE TRAFFIC—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	PASSENGER AND FREIGHT TRAFFIC.										EXPENSES OF RUNNING AND MANAGEMENT OF ALL TRAINS EARN'G REVENUE	
	Passenger and freight revenue.	PASSENGER AND FREIGHT REV. PR MILE OF R'D		PASSENGER AND FREIGHT EARN'GS.		GROSS EARNINGS FROM OPERATION.		EXPENSES.		Net earnings per mile.	Total.	Per tr'n mile—cents.
		Miles.	Amount.	Amount.	Per mile of road.	Amount.	Per mile of road.	Amount.	Per mile.			
Ames & College	\$ 5,178.87	1 98	\$2,615.58	\$ 5,178.87	\$2,615.58	\$ 5,178.87	\$2,615.58	\$ 3,919.01	\$1,979.29	\$ 685.79		
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	107,853.16	19.86	5,430.67	117,850.20	5,934.05	119,095.53	5,996.75	74,212.36	3,736.78	2,259.97		
Boone Valley	11,642.38	3.00	3,880.76	11,642.38	3,880.76	11,642.38	3,880.76	5,675.27	1,891.76	1,989.00		
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & N	4,221,133.99	960.73	3,393.67	4,395,394.39	4,575.05	4,401,394.39	4,581.30	2,942,427.23	3,062.70	1,518.60		
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N-W	16,486.95	18.38	898.09	16,486.95	898.09	16,486.95	898.09	13,160.70	710.60	140.62	\$ 4,379.20	46.00
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy												
Chicago, Burlington & K. C.												
Kansas City, St. Joe. & C. B.												
St. Louis, Keokuk & N-W												
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des M	72,785.62	71.00	1,025.17	82,861.40	1,167.06	82,861.40	1,167.06	82,399.76	1,160.56	6.50		
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	32,445.48	26.40	1,228.90	34,869.18	1,320.80	34,869.18	1,320.80	21,739.07	823.48	497.32		
Chicago Great Western	2,811,171.52	465.35	6,040.98	2,914,491.62	6,263.00	2,922,033.62	6,279.26	2,014,864.13	4,329.35	1,949.91		
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. P.	9,054,166.92	1,553.47	5,828.35	9,531,766.77	6,135.79	9,549,285.49	6,147.07	6,885,387.47	4,432.26	1,714.80		
Chicago, Rock Island & Pac.	6,132,688.75	1,188.76	5,738.13	6,469,648.99	6,053.42	6,506,404.01	6,087.81	3,891,617.35	3,454.11	2,633.70		
Chicago & North-Western	9,605,399.07	1,166.19	8,236.56	10,044,096.34	8,612.74	10,055,909.51	8,622.87	5,586,113.21	4,790.05	3,832.82	5,857,277.57	74.69
Chicago, St. Paul, Minn. & O	740,899.99	102.05	7,260.17	780,660.10	7,649.78	770,433.97	7,549.57	428,130.30	4,195.30	3,354.27		
Sioux City & Pacific	411,956.40	80.47	5,119.38	446,962.54	5,554.40	456,286.25	5,670.27	240,535.10	2,989.13	2,681.14	255,815.45	68.00
Crooked Creek	10,856.20	17.61	616.47	11,565.00	656.72	11,565.00	656.72	17,362.50	985.94	*329.22		
Des Moines, Northern & W'n	492,552.94	148.89	3,303.16	517,273.39	3,474.20	523,223.26	3,514.15	331,197.37	2,224.44	1,289.71		
Dubuque & Sioux City	2,749,074.17	573.24	4,795.68	2,922,076.84	5,097.48	2,948,616.73	5,143.77	1,630,412.35	2,844.20	2,299.57		
Stacyville railroad	6,594.27	7.93	831.56	7,209.50	909.15	7,210.91	909.32	6,529.15	823.35	85.97		
Des Moines Union						133,713.58	36,138.81	91,696.08	24,782.72	11,356.09		
Iowa Central	1,522,420.19	415.72	3,662.11	1,587,111.92	3,781.64	1,588,674.04	3,819.07	1,052,450.72	2,531.38	1,287.69		
Albia & Centerville	39,069.75	24.44	1,598.59	40,732.11	1,666.62	40,813.70	1,669.95	33,850.24	1,385.03	281.92		
Iowa Northern	15,659.39	6.93	2,259.65	15,659.39	2,259.65	15,659.39	2,259.65	11,858.06	1,711.11	548.54	11,858.06	190.90
Keokuk & Western	348,859.77	175.59	1,986.78	375,384.93	2,137.84	398,823.99	2,271.34	263,021.97	1,497.93	523.02		
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	202,215.09	92.00	2,197.99	208,912.50	2,270.79	209,080.85	2,272.62	117,863.16	1,281.12	991.50		
Minneapolis & St. Louis	422,969.90	139.51	3,031.82	461,877.73	3,310.71	469,196.97	3,363.18	322,812.20	2,313.90	1,049.28		
Muscatine North & South	12,063.30	28.67	421.46	12,278.03	428.25	12,284.08	428.46	14,425.93	503.17	*74.71		
Omaha & St. Louis	200,948.11	65.72	3,089.33	211,789.02	3,354.55	211,789.02	3,354.55	218,418.12	3,321.90		289,741.42	53.00
Sioux City & Northern	245,476.25	77.98	3,147.93	254,632.82	3,265.36	261,719.86	3,356.24	157,651.28	2,021.68	1,334.55	61,973.11	57.00
Tabor & Northern	12,448.73	8.79	1,416.23	13,193.72	1,500.99	13,423.09	1,527.08	8,011.41	911.42	615.66		
Union Pacific												
Wabash	158,508.09	86.70	1,271.11	179,888.28	1,442.57	179,888.28	1,442.57	212,282.91	1,702.35	*259.78		
Winona & Western	35,757.95	23.50	1,521.61	37,662.75	1,602.67	38,250.99	1,627.70	25,918.49	1,102.91	524.78		
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.												
Burlington & Northwestern	86,693.76	52.50	1,651.31	91,578.75	1,744.36	91,578.75	1,744.36	48,165.09	917.43	826.93		
Burlington & Western	94,688.88	70.70	908.71	101,240.06	971.55	101,240.76	971.55	91,094.92	874.23	97.36		
Total	\$39,780,685.86	7,654.06	5,203.90	\$41,901,976.53	5,343.70	\$42,188,744.64	5,511.90	\$28,645,202.77	3,729.00	1,782.90		

\* Deficit.

TABLE 54—MILEAGE TRAFFIC—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	TRAIN MILEAGE—MILES RUN.							AV. NUMBER OF CARS IN TRAIN.		MILEAGE OF FREIGHT CARS.			
	BY TRAINS EARNING REVENUE.				BY OTHER TR'S.								
	Passenger trains.	Freight trains.	Mixed trains.	Total.	Switching.	Construction and others.	Grand total train mileage.	All.	Loaded.	Empty.	Loaded, north or east.	Loaded, south or west.	Empty, north or east.
Ames & College													
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	47,460	93,081		140,541			140,541	26	17	1	721,895	891,191	325,265
Boone Valley													
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Nor.	1,182,882	1,619,737		2,802,619	353,160	122,418	3,278,197						
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N-W			9,520	9,520			9,520	8	5	3			
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy													
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas Cy													
Kansas City, St. Joe. & C. Bluffs													
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwest'n													
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines	45,652	46,502		92,154			92,154						
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	10,816	21,639		32,448			32,448						
Chicago Great Western	938,977	1,304,556		2,243,533	192,669	85,122	2,521,324	15	13	8	10,342,493	9,946,568	2,867,467
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	1,923,932	5,361,211	165,529	7,450,672			7,450,672						
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	1,936,055	2,867,836		4,803,891	1,095,684	171,739	6,071,314	19	14	5	20,359,782	20,233,717	6,990,708
Chicago, & North-Western	2,361,395	5,229,967	250,923	7,842,285	2,016,859	394,255	10,253,399	21	16	5	45,184,750	43,081,437	15,945,211
Chicago, St. Paul, Minn. & Omaha	155,827	224,523	10,442	390,792	90,130	2,558	483,480						
Sioux City & Pacific	209,819	157,507	5,610	372,936	67,540	1,323	441,799	13	9	4	753,935	705,768	329,371
Crooked Creek													
Des Moines Northern & Western	215,464	131,816	30,382	377,662		22,812	400,474	10	7	3	545,970	545,348	251,116
Dubuque & Sioux City	933,073	1,156,157		2,089,230	417,944	30,938	2,538,112	19	15	4	9,130,383	8,681,685	2,174,897
Stacyville railroad	5,216	4,976		10,192			10,583	7	5	2	10,798	11,581	5,321
Des Moines Union					391								
Iowa Central	527,958	863,610		1,391,468	308,166	65,525	1,665,159	17	12	5	*5,836,323	*4,438,158	*1,910,219
Albia & Centerville	30,822	16,989		47,811	96	3,924	51,831	14	8	6	*124,039	*17,450	*3,484
Iowa Northern			10,016	10,016			10,016	12	12	12	87,746	37,746	37,746
Keokuk & Western	206,700	162,302		369,002	65,462	7,104	441,568	14	9	5			
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	49,160	60,268		109,428			109,428	10	7	3	277,764	166,484	46,225
Minneapolis & St. Louis	189,607	180,700		370,307	75,016	1,234	446,557	17	14	8	1,194,042	1,319,954	210,417
Muscatine North & South	7,540	8,004		15,544			19,612	9	5	4	11,948	25,475	20,817
Omaha & St. Louis	124,663	117,001		241,664	58,412	12,600	312,676	16	10	6			
Sioux City & Northern	50,202	58,345		108,547	29,751	2,005	140,303	22	17	5	491,257	505,944	189,468
Tabor & Northern													
Union Pacific													
Wabash	125,415	142,026		267,441	48,792	7,025	323,253	24	17	7			
Winona & Western	14,706	14,706		29,410			29,410						
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.													
Burlington & Northwestern	14,270	12,539		26,809	10,774		37,583						
Burlington & Western	98,100	97,287		195,387	14,252		179,639						
Total	11,375,710	19,953,177	482,422	31,811,309	4,745,098	934,960	37,491,357				95,042,458	90,619,802	31,399,999

\*North or west. †South or east.



TABLE 55—MILEAGE TRAFFIC—ENTIRE LINE.

RAILROADS.	PASSENGER TRAFFIC.									
	Number of passengers carried earning revenue.	Number of passengers carried one mile.	Average distance carried—miles.	Total passenger revenue.	Av amt rec'd from each passenger.	Av rec'd per passenger mile—cents.	Total passenger earnings.	Passenger earnings per mile of road.	Passenger earnings per train mile.	
Ames & College	666,832		1.98				\$ 3,334.11			
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	2,825,376	240,622,100	85.16	\$ 5,324,040.45	1.88	2.213	\$ 7,198,390.35	\$ 1,559.62	\$1.14307	
Boone Valley	918,203						545.75			
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern	3,164	40,134,137	43.70	959,480.64	1.04	2.391	1,623,405.68	1,022.82	80388	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern	3,164	44,206	14.00	1,653.94	.52	3.5	1,653.94	59.07	1.00349	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	8,487,927	336,383,216	39.87	7,025,497.84	*.61	2.086	9,433,781.29	1,503.01	73166	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City	160,336	3,073,931	19.17	93,298.95	.58	3.036	123,558.75	569.63	509.63	
Kansas City, St. Jo and Council Bluffs	654,371	35,625,145	54.44	693,247.98	1.06	1.946	812,281.44	2,624.51	1.06343	
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern	507,911	24,506,906	40.99	501,513.14	.84	2.046	620,459.78	2,845.43	93807	
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines	25,440	625,680	24.60	15,405.95	.44	2.482	25,481.23	358.89	55811	
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota	19,203	268,842	14.00	6,828.66	.32	2.55	8,498.21	321.80	785	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	1,164,510	53,888,195	45.40	1,057,880.36	.91	2.2	1,361,409.90	1,464.72	63465	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	7,677,769	290,017,172	37.77	6,778,321.20	.88	2.387	9,304,240.44	1,502.95	1.09850	
Chicago & North-Western	5,770,046	244,943,476	42.45	4,986,505.30	.85	2.036	6,089,434.63	1,682.40	98156	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	15,305,503	420,515,240	27.48	8,202,934.87	.53	1.951	9,860,771.54	1,898.95	22087	
Sioux City & Pacific	1,817,094	94,423,573	50.86	2,126,987.78	1.17	2.301	2,657,202.65	1,713.68	1.02933	
Crooked Creek	238,569	9,416,359	40.31	209,613.96	.89	2.226	254,471.51	2,388.94	1.18483	
Des Moines, Northern & Western	194,974	5,039,342	26.00	701.01			1,410.81	80.11		
Dubuque & Sioux City	5,029,342			111,241.09	.57	2.019	135,901.54	913.17	6096	
Stacyville railroad	689,802	27,742,618	40.22	669,167.81	.97	2.413	846,620.03	1,412.00	21898	
Des Moines Union	3,397	21,536	6.56	531.63	.16	2.466	1,146.95	144.63		
Iowa Central	539,634	14,784,479	27.00	\$48,079.27	.64	2.35	435,493.82	835.97	85041	
Albia & Centerville	19,022	313,935	16.00	8,064.14	.42	2.568	9,726.50	397.07	31566	
Iowa Northern	13,921	45,403	3.33	1,392.18	.10	3	1,392.18	200.89	64229	
Keokuk & Western	245,500	6,820,306	27.88	165,674.14	.67	2.419	204,681.76	788.80	80016	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	56,639	1,192,963	21.10	32,658.12	.58	2.736	39,335.53	437.65	93126	
Minneapolis & St. Louis	657,077	24,876,877	59.72	494,031.35	.75	1.986	609,177.73	1,462.47	21998	
Muscatine, North & South	8,231	49,079	15.00	1,463.19	.45	2.981	1,557.97	67.83	7817	
Omaha & St. Louis	188,398	8,195,568	32.33	166,921.90	.88	2.56	212,248.22	384.89	60077	
Sioux City & Northern	23,716	933,925	41.49	27,599.23	1.16	2.805	37,432.74	384.89	60077	
Tabor & Northern				3,670.64			4,432.69			
Union Pacific	3,751,019	210,592,939	56.14	3,095,102.07	1.66	1.897	4,079,967.59	2,186.40	79416	
Wabash	42,845	953,691	22.00	26,270.98	.61	2.754	35,377.65	311.64	49732	
Winona & Western										
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.										
Burlington & Northwestern	24,058	512,301	21.00	14,552.11	.60	2.841	19,437.10	370.23	1.3621	
Burlington & Western	38,011	644,296	22.97	15,256.48	.54	2.868	21,807.68	209.39	32023	
Total	52,749,818	2,094,317,978		\$44,068,172.41			\$ 56,407,487.69			
*Excludes Minneapolis										

\*East of Missouri river.

TABLE 56—MILEAGE TRAFFIC—ENTIRE LINE.

RAILROADS.	FREIGHT TRAFFIC.									
	No. of tons of freight carried	No. of tons carried one mile.	Av. distance haul of one ton.	Total freight revenue.	Av. amount received for each ton of freight.	Av. receipts per ton per mile—cents.	Total freight earnings.	Frt. earnings per mile of road.	Frt. earnings per ton mile.	Av. cost per ton per mile to freighter.
Ames & College	7,059,351	2,012,013,566	285.13	\$19,168,041.36	\$ 2.71.925	.953	\$ 19,250,925.36	\$ 4,172.29	\$ 1.63.401	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	2,218,912	307,932,547	138.78	3,637,699.75	1.63.40	1.178	3,637,699.75	3,192.06	\$ 0.107	
Burlington, Ued. Rap. & Nor.	21,671	303,506	14.00	14,659.79	.67.6	2.57	14,659.79	1,047.13	3.96.07	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N.W.	13,883,680	2,502,157,657	*172.18	22,736,132.15	*1.33.217	.909	22,767,070.06	3,844.40	1.63.750	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	306,809	29,203,409	95.19	285,026.01	.92.9	.976	285,026.01	1,290.00	1.24.9	
Chicago, Burlington & K.C.	1,648,258	135,733,092	82.35	1,327,088.75	.80.515	.978	1,327,088.75	4,287.85	2.32.62	
Kansas City, St. Jo. & U.B.	1,709,161	210,832,722	117.19	1,550,342.65	.86.17	.745	1,550,342.65	5,860.52	2.24.242	
St. Louis, Keokuk & N.W.	34,902	1,681,578	48.18	57,379.67	1.64.402	2.412	57,379.67	808.16	1.23.302	
Chicago, Ft. Madison & D.M.	30,610	536,120	12.00	25,616.82	.83.922	4.004	26,370.97	321.80	1.21	
Chicago Great Western	1,729,854	18,656		4,475,406.15	2.60		4,475,406.15	4,814.80	1.58.75	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. P.	15,830,156	3,070,579,710	193.97	28,773,222.43	1.81.762	.937	28,865,108.07	4,662.68	1.78.448	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	7,053,249	1,435,590,531	203.54	14,299,529.46	2.02.787	.996	14,299,529.46	3,050.83	1.71.522	
Chicago & North-Western	21,551,134	3,309,815,933	154.00	29,052,838.84	1.34.809	.878	29,058,476.13	5,719.77	1.86.701	
Chicago, St. P., Minneapolis & O	4,740,198	808,181,781	170.50	7,827,558.94	1.65.131	.969	7,836,527.29	5,251.55	2.39.186	
Sioux City & Pacific	618,441	21,076,398	40.69	256,478.77	.49.759	1.217	256,487.29	2,387.70	1.34.26	
Crooked Creek										
Des Moines, Northern & Western	348,087	13,661,010	39.20	381,311.55	1.06.54	2.78	381,411.85	2,561.01	2.46.83	
Dubuque & Sioux City	1,149,958	186,208,895	163.21	2,097,295.39	1.83.819	1.126	2,097,299.64	3,497.59	1.78.374	
Stacyville railroad	13,699	93,721	6.84	6,062.64	.44.256	6.469	6,062.64	764.52	1.21.838	
Des Moines Union	1,548,411	205,650,338	133.50	1,693,259.71	1.09.9	.823	1,693,259.71	3,326.77	1.43.44	
Iowa Central	136,750	2,441,233	17.00	31,005.61	.22.673	1.271	31,005.61	1,268.68	1.83.5	
Albia & Centerville	191,736	715,196	4.00	14,267.21	.07.8	1.93	14,267.21	200.89	1.42.444	
Keokuk & Western	33,983,295	33,983,295	129.84	347,354.59	1.32.328	1.082	347,354.59	1,537.78	1.45.532	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	191,533	1,552,042	23.86	169,576.97	.88.527	3.076	169,576.97	1,843.29	1.61.371	
Minneapolis & St. Louis	1,538,278	156,579,613	102.00	1,860,257.57	1.21.167	1.190	1,860,257.57	4,465.98	4.48.887	
Muscatine North & South	17,354	452,818	26.00	10,630.11	.61.107	2.343	10,630.11	370.43	1.32.685	
Omaha & St. Louis	301,796	32,955,443	108.00	269,921.83	.89.4	.82	269,921.83	1,874.45	1.18.71	
Sioux City & Northern	263,398	17,053,871	64.75	290,615.74	1.10.333	1.134	291,575.74	3,000.36	3.96.71	
Tabor & Northern				8,778.09			8,761.03	996.70		
Union Pacific	6,887,641	1,696,530,055	245.54	9,212,061.70	1.31.843	.553	9,414,006.56	4,133.12	1.32.567	
Wabash	122,413	6,610,292	54.00	145,973.45	1.19.247	22.083	145,973.45	811.64	2.05.993	
Winona & Western										
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.										
Burlington & Northwestern	74,708	2,427,276	32.00	72,141.65	.95.226	2.972	72,141.65	1,372.22	5.75.337	
Burlington & Western	90,214	5,401,974	58.77	79,432.38	.88.043	1.496	79,432.38	762.31	.81.647	
Total	91,649,690	16,281,377,581		\$150,068,012.56			\$150,610,415.78	4,301.43	1.80.149	

\*East of Missouri river.



TABLE 57—MILEAGE TRAFFIC—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	PASSENGER AND FREIGHT.										EXPENSES.				Net earnings per mile of road.	
	PASSENGER AND FREIGHT SERVICE.			PASSENGER AND FREIGHT EARNINGS.		GROSS EARNINGS FROM OPERATION.										
	Amount.	Miles.	Per mile.	Amount.	Per mile.	Amount.	Per mile.	Amount.	Per mile.	Amount.	Per mile.	Per mile.	Per mile.	Per mile.		
Ames & College.						\$ 5,178.87	\$2,615.58			\$ 3,919.01	\$1,929.79			\$ 685.70		
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.	\$ 24,512,081.81	4,615.45	\$5,310.87	\$ 20,455,312.73	\$5,731.90	\$ 20,804,331.57	\$5,807.52	\$ 17,100,616.99	\$3,705.08	\$ 17,100,616.99	\$3,705.08			\$ 2,102.44		
Boone Valley.						11,644.38	3,880.76			5,673.27	1,891.76			1,089.00		
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.	4,587,180.39	1,136.47	4,030.34	4,790,105.45	4,214.89	4,790,105.45	4,230.17	3,317,996.25	2,831.57	3,317,996.25	2,831.57			1,388.60		
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.	16,486.95	18.38	898.00	16,486.95	898.00	16,486.95	898.00	13,160.70	710.60	13,160.70	710.60			140.62		
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.	20,761,629.99	5,921.99	5,025.61	32,200,857.35	5,437.81	33,163,529.34	5,600.07	10,700,527.91	3,320.67	10,700,527.91	3,320.67			2,273.40		
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.	378,324.95	820.95	1,712.26	410,884.70	1,839.63	416,354.28	1,884.38	329,276.80	1,323.27	329,276.80	1,323.27			561.11		
Kansas City, St. Joe & Council Bluffs.	2,029,536.73	309.50	5,927.74	2,130,573.19	6,912.36	2,243,559.87	7,248.27	1,833,152.91	4,921.33	1,833,152.91	4,921.33			2,355.94		
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.	2,051,555.79	204.54	7,756.32	2,170,825.45	8,505.23	2,341,413.36	8,850.88	1,548,318.88	5,882.87	1,548,318.88	5,882.87			2,998.01		
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.	72,785.63	71.00	1,025.17	82,861.40	1,167.06	82,861.40	1,167.06	62,399.76	1,100.56	62,399.76	1,100.56			6.50		
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.	32,445.48	26.40	1,228.90	34,869.18	1,320.80	34,869.18	1,320.80	21,730.07	833.48	21,730.07	833.48			497.32		
Chicago Great Western.	5,533,586.51	929.51	5,953.01	5,896,876.05	6,279.62	5,854,336.78	6,298.30	4,832,576.79	4,661.14	4,832,576.79	4,661.14			1,537.16		
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	35,552,143.63	6,190.67	5,742.95	38,169,948.51	6,165.63	38,310,632.49	6,188.44	22,776,670.42	3,679.19	22,776,670.42	3,679.19			2,509.25		
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	19,284,094.76	3,619.37	5,328.56	20,398,944.05	5,632.29	20,647,216.45	5,704.65	12,124,331.66	3,226.14	12,124,331.66	3,226.14			2,078.51		
Chicago & North-Western.	37,254,773.71	5,085.62	7,325.71	38,949,347.60	7,388.72	39,054,953.19	7,679.49	24,360,395.04	4,700.00	24,360,395.04	4,700.00			2,860.41		
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.	9,054,546.72	1,492.36	6,070.92	10,363,729.94	6,965.23	10,476,496.98	7,020.70	6,314,606.98	4,231.66	6,314,606.98	4,231.66			2,789.04		
Sioux City & Pacific.	466,092.73	107.42	4,338.98	510,958.71	4,766.24	531,261.63	4,945.65	321,092.10	2,989.13	321,092.10	2,989.13			1,956.52		
Crooked Creek.	10,866.80	17.61	616.47	11,585.00	656.72	11,585.00	656.72	17,362.70	985.94	17,362.70	985.94			*329.22		
Des Moines, Northern & Western.	492,552.94	148.89	3,308.16	517,273.39	3,474.20	528,228.26	3,514.15	331,197.37	2,224.44	331,197.37	2,224.44			1,280.71		
Dubuque & Sioux City.	2,766,763.20	599.59	4,514.43	2,943,919.67	4,909.89	2,970,459.56	4,954.15	1,664,352.66	2,775.32	1,664,352.66	2,775.32			2,178.38		
Stacyville railroad.	6,694.27	7.92	831.56	7,209.50	909.13	7,210.91	909.39	5,539.15	833.35	5,539.15	833.35			85.97		
Des Moines Union.		3.70				13,712.58	3,613.81	11,698.08	3,124.72	11,698.08	3,124.72			1,366.09		
Iowa Central.	2,041,338.98	508.98	4,010.63	2,118,753.53	4,162.82	2,130,575.11	4,166.39	1,518,176.63	2,982.78	1,518,176.63	2,982.78			1,183.54		
Albia & Centerville.	39,069.75	24.44	1,568.59	40,738.11	1,666.62	40,813.70	1,669.95	33,850.24	1,283.03	33,850.24	1,283.03			284.92		
Iowa Northern.	15,659.39	6.93	2,259.65	15,659.39	2,259.65	15,659.39	2,259.65	11,858.06	1,711.11	11,858.06	1,711.11			548.54		
Keokuk & Western.	513,029.07	259.65	1,975.85	532,036.69	2,126.08	536,508.67	2,259.22	386,797.02	1,489.68	386,797.02	1,489.68			769.15		
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.	2,024,215.09	92.00	2,197.99	2,098,912.50	2,270.79	2,098,912.50	2,270.79	1,178,653.16	1,281.12	1,178,653.16	1,281.12			991.60		
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	2,354,259.95	508.56	4,633.01	2,469,435.39	4,938.45	2,465,064.98	4,935.09	1,516,316.69	3,040.27	1,516,316.69	3,040.27			2,709.82		
Muscatine, North & South.	12,083.30	28.87	421.46	12,973.08	428.28	12,973.08	428.28	14,435.93	503.17	14,435.93	503.17			*74.71		
Omaha & St. Louis.	430,543.73	143.39	3,039.33	482,150.05	3,354.55	482,150.05	3,354.55	474,829.39	3,311.40	474,829.39	3,311.40			1,453.40		
Sioux City & Northern.	318,214.99	97.28	3,271.12	339,318.48	3,385.36	338,057.83	3,475.10	196,670.78	2,021.69	196,670.78	2,021.69			1,453.40		
Tabor & Northern.	12,448.73	8.79	1,416.23	13,193.72	1,500.99	13,423.09	1,537.08	8,011.41	911.43	8,011.41	911.43			615.66		
Union Pacific.																
Wabash.	13,207,793.77	2,321.10	5,798.74	14,393,974.15	6,319.52	14,468,733.49	6,347.96	10,569,097.38	4,640.65	10,569,097.38	4,640.65			1,707.31		
Winona & Western.	172,244.43	113.20	1,521.59	181,251.10	1,601.15	184,253.81	1,627.68	124,848.19	1,102.89	124,848.19	1,102.89			624.78		
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.																
Burlington & Northwestern.	86,093.76	62.50	1,361.31	91,578.75	1,444.36	91,578.75	1,444.36	48,165.09	917.48	48,165.09	917.48			826.93		
Burlington & Western.	94,688.86	70.70	908.71	101,240.06	971.55	101,240.06	971.55	51,094.92	874.23	51,094.92	874.23			97.36		
Total.	\$194,264,486	19,253.41	5,689.51	\$207,041,255.85	5,911.51	\$210,756,359.07	\$6,184.23	\$131,963,503.38	\$3,767.86	\$131,963,503.38	\$3,767.86			\$2,416.37		

\* Deficit.

TABLE 58—MILEAGE TRAFFIC—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	MILES RUN.						AV. NUMBER CARS IN TRAIN.			CAR MILEAGE.					
	BY TRAINS EARNING REVENUE.				BY OTHER TRAINS		Grand total train mileage.	Freight.	Loaded.	Empty.	Loaded freight cars, north or south.	Loaded freight cars, south or west.	Empty cars, north or east.	Empty cars, south or west.	
	Passenger.	Freight.	Mixed.	Total.	Switching.	Construction and other.									
Ames & College.															
Atchison, Topeka & S. Fe.	5,964,812	10,790,374	1,329,219	18,084,405	2,904,875	688,574	21,678,854	21	15	6	51,168,496	91,415,515	87,488,804	32,019,434	
Boone Valley.	1,299,288	1,760,100		3,059,388	875,573	122,418	3,557,379	29	21	8	18,682,787	14,613,357	4,792,680	2,423,331	
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Nor.			9,820	9,820			9,820	8	5	3					
Cedar Rapids, Garner & N. W.	8,627,211	13,900,242		22,527,453			22,527,453	22	16	6				3,850,176	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.	173,018	228,208		400,221		21,732	481,943	11	7	1	21,794,160			2,809,678	
Kansas Cy., St. Joe & C. B.	763,834	993,467		1,757,301	513,666	76,785	1,947,748	21	16	5	39,801,188			73,362,638	
St. Louis, Keokuk & N.-W.	601,422	691,370		1,292,792	387,245	136,468	1,876,500	26	21	5	514,513,615				
Chi., Ft. Madison & D. M.	45,622	48,503		94,125			94,125								
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.	2,071,540	21,628		21,628		32,448	32,448				18,754	14,734	2,740	8,749	
Chicago Great Western.	2,071,540	2,819,147		4,890,687	712,668	177,719	5,781,074	20	15	5	24,357,850	20,761,909	4,977,488	8,937,445	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. P.	8,188,468	15,831,606	1,125,306	24,645,382	4,309,209	891,908	29,846,166	22	16	6	142,944,433	116,906,211	20,840,882	68,254,581	
Chicago, Rock I. & Pacific.	7,808,851	8,336,537		15,540,388	3,890,372	618,692	19,039,442	20	15	5	63,907,012	61,503,728	2,403,275	22,929,761	
Chicago & North-Western.	10,466,778	14,796,159	1,045,432	26,308,369	9,248,307	1,530,609	36,067,286	22	16	6	130,946,354	132,707,233	50,287,638	43,035,881	
Chi., St. Paul, Minn. & O.	2,395,608	2,854,342	418,362	5,768,312	1,333,140	154,423	7,355,869	22	17	5	27,321,119	30,597,735	8,180,360	7,024,666	
Sioux City & Pacific.	210,919	176,798	19,098	406,813	105,480	8,120	514,413	14	10	4	992,020	929,642	433,383	445,999	
Crooked Creek.															
Des Moines Northern & W.	215,444	121,810	30,382	367,632		22,812	400,474	10	7	3					
Dubuque & Sioux City.	953,092	1,175,787		2,128,879	428,594	31,518	2,588,991	19	15	4	9,224,152	8,790,453	2,221,968	2,894,708	
Stacyville railroad.	5,216	4,976		10,192	391		10,583	6	4	2		11,581		5,331	6,760
Des Moines Union.															
Iowa Central.	654,152	1,180,434		1,834,586	301,076	108,446	2,244,112	16	11	5	*374,317	*16,155,663	*2,749,787	73,356,282	
Albia & Centerville.	30,322	16,969		47,291	96	3,294	51,331	14	8	6	*124,639	*17,480	73,484	95,800	
Iowa Northern.	318,670	228,079	10,016	557,355	90,207	10,447	664,099	13	9	4	1,079,997	1,176,974	524,395	546,166	
Keokuk & Western.	49,160	60,398		109,558			109,558	10	7	3	277,794	166,484	40,225	158,559	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.	49,160	60,398		109,558			109,558	10	7	3	277,794	166,484	40,225	158,559	
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	654,146	747,481		1,401,577	300,288	30,846	1,732,711	19	16	3	5,727,386	6,498,426	1,564,099	819,474	
Muscatine North & South.	7,540	8,004		15,544		4,368	19,912	9	5	4	11,948	25,475	20,917	2,299	
Omaha & St. Louis.	271,443	254,309		525,753	129,984	29,339	686,170	16	10	6					
Sioux City & Northern.	62,334	73,574		135,908	36,987	2,228	115,113	21	16	5	617,987	594,887	184,771	212,213	
Tabor & Northern.															
Union Pacific.															
Wabash.	6,570,793	7,101,384		13,672,177	4,489,597	851,261	16,162,033	24	17	7					
Wisconsin & Western.	70,863	70,863		141,726			141,726								
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.															
Burlington & Northwestern.	14,370	12,539		26,909	10,774		37,683								
Burlington & Western.	68,100	97,287		165,387	14,252		179,639								
Total.	66,705,916	83,625,790	3,081,355	144,313,061	26,485,641	5,114,465	175,911,261				336,182,023	402,514,200	180,968,083	194,360,353	



TABLE 59—TONNAGE—IOWA.

RAILROADS.	PRODUCTS OF AGRICULTURE.										PRODUCTS OF ANIMALS.							
	Grain.	Flour.	Other mill products.	Hay.	Tobacco.	Fruit or vegetables.	Grass seed.	Broom corn.	Butter.	Eggs.	Cheese.	Live stock.	Dressed meats.	Other packing house products.	Poultry, game and fish.	Wool.	Hides and leather.	Milk.
Ames & College																		
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe																		
Boone Valley																		
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern	715,609	166,699	15,502	23,212		42,363	27,927		*18,333			164,049		14,494				
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern	8,728	24		663					70	40			564					
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy																		
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City																		
Kansas City, St Jo & Council Bluffs																		
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern																		
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines	8,798	478	101	821	7	401	293	21	+1,127			6,338	1,553	3,014	580	31	212	
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota																		
Chicago Great Western																		
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	732,502	30,225	31,835	20,389	82	11,168	†9,870		12,468	9,984		261,825	3,039	38,347	3,026	3,407	1,659	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific																		
Chicago & North-Western	1,267,474	23,140	42,186	25,137	54	22,984			8,239			328,084	42,056	66,095	3,523	4,917	5,293	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	79,773	7,219	13,213	4,566	1,753							61,346	7,640	8,906	70	33	163	
Sioux City & Pacific	92,414	4,396	3,395	6,547	205	9,679			1,128			38,340	2,082	23,394	278		1,629	
Crooked Creek	4,570	46	10	15		32				12		768			22			
Des Moines, Northern & Western	84,986	4,274	5,224	3,431		1,601	1,431	514				27,747	2,157		69	477	119	230
Dubuque & Sioux City	410,187	15,004	8,623	6,677	161	15,471			7,070	665		131,997		11,160	1,699	139	904	
Stacyville railroad	6,241	70	12			659			43			1,514			7		2	
Des Moines Union																		
Iowa Central	245,917	27,053	53	1,487		6,203						84,820	103	19,021	423	699	658	
Albia & Centerville	394	671	12	20		100						455						
Iowa Northern																		
Keokuk & Western	30,028	4,209	1,394	1,667	43	1,993			1,528			23,774	237	27	613	153	86	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge	64,041	76	314	338		437			257			8,008		133	35			
Minneapolis & St. Louis	162,926	9,172	6,144	5,597		4,799						16,201	302	110		6	93	
Muscatine North & South	2,777	184	3,383	7		135						616						
Omaha & St. Louis	29,977	1,148	340	65		850						12,488		4,205	370			
Sioux City & Northern	129,637	8,070	5,592	139		1,981			316			19,162		3,019	99	16	28	
Tabor & Northern																		
Union Pacific																		
Wabash	23,488	3,030	3,744	1,307	92	2,582	†1,212					5,990	5,108	3,251		107	756	
Winona & Western	12,321	89	112			393						1,903			12	13	13	
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.																		
Burlington & Northwestern																		
Burlington & Western																		
Total	4,100,787	305,277	141,189	102,085	2,397	123,834	40,736	535	50,581	10,701	204	1,195,405	64,843	195,206	11,244	9,521	11,615	230

\* Includes eggs. † Includes eggs, butter and cheese. ‡ Other agricultural products. § Cotton.

TABLE 60—TONNAGE—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	PRODUCTS OF MINES.						PRODUCTS OF FOREST.				MANUFACTURES.						
	Anthracite coal.	Bituminous coal.	Coke.	Ores.	Stone, sand and like articles.	Salt.	Lumber.	Ties, logs, cordw'd and other forest products.	Telegraph, telephone and electric light poles.	Petroleum and other oils.	Sugar.	Iron—pig and bloom.	Iron and steel rails.	Other cast'gs and machinery.	Bar and sheet metal.	Cement and lime.	
Ames & College.....																	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....																	
Boone Valley.....																	
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	69,255	251,787			43,792		227,359									28,122	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	49	1,706			312	105	7,544	51						41		200	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....																	
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....																	
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....																	
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....																	
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	31	1,592	3		688	3,099	2,395	565		269	171	66		807	151		
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....																	
Chicago Great Western.....																	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	332	261,668	48	1,478	79,427	99	95,275	41,009		5,186		6,038		3,154	2,739	17,737	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....																	
Chicago & North-Western.....	16,224	778,939	11,246	4,216	45,655	1,198	153,244	25,479		4,182	10,301	8,298	10,511	5,290	2,866	5,940	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	1,521	14,303	38		847		4,784			1,519	495	568		815			
Sioux City & Pacific.....	2,913	77,608	889	4,378	1,500	2,094	45,428	9,860		1,496	8,633	314	15	1,246	960	660	
Crooked Creek.....	375	2,310					503	36		1			240	48		6	
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....	5,530	88,609		18	3,415	1,307	25,000	9,073		1,987	377		1,027	1,657	87	23,754	
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	36,014	137,904	964		21,408	12,952	97,244	325		10,666	9,588		802	9,405	4,901	42,670	
Stacyville railroad.....	292	1,363			111	107	1,104			5	1			110	29	128	
Des Moines Union.....																	
Iowa Central.....	12,854	645,736	22,460		23,680	4,027	68,339			11,658	5,945	5,596	9,972	2,651	385		
Albia & Centerville.....	189	10,873			420	106	817					56	23	24		645	
Iowa Northern.....																	
Keokuk & Western.....	905	56,858	168		2,130	1,357	16,339	4,219		1,506	2,925			639			
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	2,374	74,132	21		4,815	394	8,826	1,104		241	781		5	858			
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	3,649	62,931		2,787	2,196		113,343			2,191	85			1,082	5	50,761	
Muscatine North & South.....	289	1,170	20			15	5,655	32		20		21		26			
Omaha & St. Louis.....		41,528			1,432	342	16,472	7,847		1,005	1,133		205		146	1,356	
Sioux City & Northern.....	6,841	22,085	56	4,109	7,399	563	20,601			1,328	571	2,275		844	110		
Tabor & Northern.....																	
Union Pacific.....																	
Wabash.....	4,444	29,978	311	438	3,881		11,863			1,425	1,020	637	1,203	1,859			
Winona & Western.....	632	935			1,484		2,064			1,332	22			111		1,247	
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.																	
Burlington & Northwestern.....																	
Burlington & Western.....																	
Total.....	164,713	2,862,814	36,224	17,424	244,592	27,763	924,199	99,600		46,217	42,048	23,869	24,003	30,667	12,379	173,280	

\* Includes brick.



TABLE 61—TONNAGE—IOWA—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	MANUFACTURES—CONTINUED.						OTHER.			Grand total— Iowa.	Originating on this road.	From other roads.
	Brick.	Tile.	Agricultural implements.	Wagons, car- riages, tools, etc.	Wines, liq- uors and beer.	Household goods and furniture.	Ice.	Merchandise.	Miscellaneous.			
Ames & College.....										*		
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....										*		
Boone Valley.....										*		
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....				77,068		16,000	1,658	121,174	143,445	*	2,187,848	1,176,338
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	235	111	82	12	101		36	945		*	21,679	12,360
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....										*		
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....										*		
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....										*		
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....										*		
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....	697		492	68	935	143		276	3,633	*	34,902	26,281
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....										*	30,510	20,058
Chicago Great Western.....										*		
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	26,833		5,036	5,230	6,087	12,481	6,230	175,790		*	1,921,701	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....										*	3,855,361	
Chicago & North-Western.....	24,165	9,983	18,830	13,547	5,272	24,269	4,154	140,010	24,459	*	3,180,441	2,510,474
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	12,070		1,344	812	813	3,789		35,854	11,864	*	276,078	194,314
Sioux City & Pacific.....	11,433	159	4,775	3,656	1,342	3,875	63	32,008	4,712	*	403,404	183,396
Crooked Creek.....	454	244	2			19		202	6,737	*	16,656	15,604
Des Moines, Northern & Western.....			2,736	1,284	3,152	2,554	2,370	36,136	5,089	*	348,087	255,810
Dubuque & Sioux City.....		3,109	4,522	3,578	3,956	4,004	2,062	28,648	93,993	*	1,138,211	754,152
Stacyville railroad.....			58	41	1	49		253	1,499	*	13,699	9,598
Des Moines Union.....										*		
Iowa Central.....	11,873	1,789	5,837	3,739	6,231	4,437	2,489	53,811	80,658	*	1,370,604	768,428
Albia & Centerville.....		66	10	37		47		1,370	415	*	136,750	132,976
Iowa Northern.....										*	178,799	178,799
Keokuk & Western.....	3,856		865	553	227	1,255		13,036	5,393	*	177,983	143,434
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....	13,752		753	470	878	614		4,798	3,098	*	191,553	168,171
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....			1,537	269	881	499		17,046	10,508	*	475,119	304,747
Muscatine North & South.....	135	27	26	10		10		1,136	1,660	*	17,354	13,230
Omaha & St. Louis.....			645	363	329	741		7,778	6,270	*	137,035	48,757
Sioux City & Northern.....	2,296		1,089	498	658	287		9,857	3,997	*	253,523	181,304
Tabor & Northern.....										*		
Union Pacific.....										*		
Wabash.....	2,850		638	276	1,320	380		9,096	17,466	*	139,752	
Winona & Western.....			177	539	13	90		1,605	286	*	25,393	
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.												
Burlington & N.-W.....										*	74,708	33,436
Burlington & Western.....										*	90,214	18,844
Total.....	110,649	15,488	49,424	112,050	32,196	75,503	19,062	690,829	425,182	*	16,677,364	7,100,516
												3,634,846

\* No report. † The total of this column is of little value, as it does not include many large roads that decline to report.

TABLE 62—TONNAGE—ENTIRE LINE.

RAILROADS.	PRODUCTS OF AGRICULTURE.									
	Grain.	Flour.	Other mill stuffs.	Hay.	Tobacco.	Fruit and vege- tables.	Grass seed.	Broom corn.	Butter.	Eggs.
Ames & College.....										
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	*1,134,583	160,485	53,771	77,945	352	238,441	*31,657			
Boone Valley.....										
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	751,159	167,463	15,801	23,214		42,923	28,603		18,473	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	8,728	24		663					70	40
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....										
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....										
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....										
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....										
Chicago, Fort Madison & Des Moines.....	3,798	478	101	821	7	404	296	21	1,127	
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....										
Chicago Great Western.....	898,928	218,821	29,422	5,810	406	51,758			12,651	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	3,604,440	533,585	197,926	79,592	33,321	198,831	159,658		*60,271	30,185
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	1,623,259	223,875	98,769	54,651	+11,712	93,131	28,254	2,644		
Chicago & North-Western.....	2,941,773	305,721	170,918	106,921	12,597	387,759			64,494	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	1,466,443	281,953	152,176	64,663	3,065	64,186				
Sioux City & Pacific.....	125,687	4,877	3,434	6,755	205	10,849			1,532	
Orooked Creek.....	4,570	46	10	16		32			4	12
Des Moines Northern & Western.....	84,986	4,274	5,224	3,431		1,601	1,431	8514	230	665
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	410,213	15,005	8,623	6,677	161	15,471			7,073	
Stacyville railroad.....	6,241	70	12			659			48	
Des Moines Union.....										
Iowa Central.....	284,223	27,857	1,564	2,443		6,603				
Albia & Centerville.....	394	671	12	20		100				
Iowa Northern.....										
Keokuk & Western.....	44,168	6,189	2,049	2,452	63	2,930			2,247	
Mason City & Fort Dodge.....	64,041	76	314	338		437			257	
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....	462,070	173,591	28,666	6,231	+2,584	38,037				
Muscatine North & South.....	2,777	184	3,383	7		135				
Omaha & St. Louis.....	65,176	2,476	740	146		1,851				
Sioux City & Northern.....	132,892	8,234	5,592	139		1,981			316	
Tabor & Northern.....										
Union Pacific.....										
Wabash.....	1,174,369	151,502	187,224	65,360	4,595	129,122	*60,605			
Winona & Western.....	59,348	478	537			1,894				
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.										
Burlington & North-Western.....										
Burlington & Western.....										
Total.....	14,953,049	2,234,435	965,368	508,394	69,068	1,286,635	315,072	2,179	188,808	30,882

\*Includes grass seed. †Cotton. ‡Dairy products. §Other.



TABLE 63—TONNAGE—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	PRODUCTS OF ANIMALS.							PRODUCTS OF MINES.					
	Live stock.	Dressed meat.	Other packing house products.	Poultry, game and fish.	Wool.	Hides and leather.	Milk.	Anthracite coal.	Bituminous coal.	Coke.	Ores.	Stone, sand, etc.	Salt.
Ames & College.													
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.	820,830	40,318	49,236	17,798	12,059	13,000		20,375	1,821,843	198,678	248,717	333,652	86,506
Boone Valley.													
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.	164,172		14,495					70,675	254,735			46,163	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.	564							49	1,708			312	105
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.													
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.													
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.													
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.													
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.	6,338	1,553	3,044	890	31	212		31	1,562			688	8,099
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.													
Chicago Great Western.	119,221	19,931	24,636	3,919	1,176	7,287			174,372	3,038	28,914	21,978	8,174
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	806,478	167,667	136,311	13,497	12,309	46,792		617,082	1,120,075	246,157	449,138	419,794	63,960
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	644,435	45,156	73,403	10,624	10,761	10,761		190,176	1,146,984	13,179	79,418	279,644	66,017
Chicago & North-Western.	553,134	77,467	176,126	24,927	11,978	48,185	104,433	745,048	2,308,557	155,377	4,727,080	618,617	87,131
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.	245,228	2,092	15,947	6,740	522	3,059		174,349	437,941	2,934	16,999	78,807	
Sioux City & Pacific.	68,828	2,082	23,613	308	37	1,885		8,878	89,503	1,283	4,393	11,308	2,038
Crooked Creek.	768							375	2,310				
Des Moines Northern & Western.	27,747	2,157	69	477		119		5,530	88,602		18	3,415	1,307
Dubuque & Sioux City.	181,997		11,160	1,699	139	906		36,014	137,918	961		23,220	12,952
Stacyville railroad.	1,514			7		2		292	1,363			111	107
Des Moines Union.													
Iowa Central.	98,770	103	20,419	516	699	717		16,351	730,370	23,227		24,917	4,564
Albia & Centerville.	458							189	130,873			420	106
Iowa Northern.									175,799				
Keokuk & Western.	24,921	348	39	901	235	126		1,331	83,614	247		3,132	1,995
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.	8,008		133	35				2,374	74,132	21		4,815	304
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	31,986	3,231	1,817	660	777			22,004	127,777	1,145	2,999	17,235	
Muscatine North & South.	616							289	1,170	20			15
Omaha & St. Louis.	27,149		9,142	792					90,296		672	3,331	744
Sioux City & Northern.	19,162		3,049	99	16	28		7,424	25,437	56	4,109	7,402	563
Tabor & Northern.													
Union Pacific.													
Wabash.	299,504	255,413	168,530		5,354	37,814		222,216	1,498,881	15,564	21,929	194,056	
Winona & Western.	9,168			57	63	60		3,093	4,504			7,152	
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.													
Burlington & Northwestern.													
Burlington & Western.													
Total.	4,409,070	640,218	728,169	73,384	58,791	172,330	104,433	3,144,115	10,433,431	863,794	5,584,386	2,100,066	339,517

TABLE 64—TONNAGE—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	PRODUCTS OF FOREST.				MANUFACTURES.						
	Lumber.	Trees, logs and cord-wood.	Telegraph, telephone and electric light poles.	Petroleum and other oils.	Sugar.	Iron-pig and bloom.	Iron and steel rails.	Other cast-ings and machinery.	Bar and sheet metal.	Cement and lime.	Brick.
Ames & College.	380,167			90,750	32,193	27,898	82,632	71,704	82,443	*142,100	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.											
Boone Valley.	230,849									28,121	235
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.	7,544	51						41		260	
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.											
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.											
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.											
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.											
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.	2,305	565		289	171	66		807	151		697
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.											
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.	134,216		*38,280	44,624	84	7,598	8,906	10,530	1,308	*37,467	
Chicago Great Western.	1,564,377	38,483	*1,564,991	187,095	4,036	161,594	124,495	104,413	50,616	*339,069	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	489,547	32,567		91,985	93,444	48,488	124,074	49,809	141,708	*324,642	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	1,658,819	1,361,368		213,931	60,675	231,300	1*0,170	204,759	341,150	100,871	201,075
Chicago & North-Western.	692,724			21,303	20,161	8,845	19,814	34,573	9,194	*63,939	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.	49,846	10,022		1,774	8,993	414	536	1,639	1,238	702	11,519
Sioux City & Pacific.	503	38		1			240	48		6	454
Crooked Creek.	25,000	9,073		1,987	377		1,027	1,657	87	*23,754	
Des Moines Northern & Western.	97,266	325		10,866	9,588		1,303	9,410	4,901	*12,670	
Dubuque & Sioux City.	1,104			5	1			110	29	128	
Stacyville railroad.											
Des Moines Union.	72,321			13,178	5,981	5,884	9,072	2,740	453	*13,774	
Iowa Central.	817					56	23			1645	
Albia & Centerville.											
Iowa Northern.	22,123	6,204	*1,904	2,214	4,155			939		*5,670	
Keokuk & Western.	8,826	1,104		241	781			58		*13,712	
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.	316,833			13,657	3,354	1,404		5,385	2,294	*10,215	
Minneapolis & St. Louis.	5,655	32		20		21		28			135
Muscatine North & South.	35,812	17,060		2,332	2,584		2,961				
Omaha & St. Louis.	21,451			1,328	571	2,275		907	110	*2,296	
Sioux City & Northern.											
Tabor & Northern.											
Union Pacific.	593,136			71,258	51,021	*1,830	60,174	92,939		*142,526	
Wabash.	9,942			6,414	108			533		*5,005	
Winona & Western.											
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.											
Burlington & Northwestern.											
Burlington & Western.											
Total.	6,421,264	1,476,980	1,605,155	775,202	307,478	519,173	542,332	504,301	641,907	1,365,557	214,115

\*Includes brick and tile. †Other forest products. ‡Includes brick. §Cooperage.



TABLE 65—TONNAGE—ENTIRE LINE—CONTINUED.

RAILROADS.	MANUFACTURES—CONTINUED.					OTHER.			Total tonnage.	Originating on Iowa road.	Received from other lines.
	Tons.	Agricultural implements.	Wagons, carriages, tools, etc.	Wine, liquor and beer.	Household furniture.	Ice.	Merchandise.	Miscellaneous.			
Ames & College.											
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.		22,812	36,578	97,659	72,089		897,834	209,713	7,056,351	5,138,534	1,917,817
Boone Valley.											
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.		77,191			16,529		121,213	147,150	2,218,912	1,865,170	833,742
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.	111	88	12	101		36	945		2,679	12,300	9,319
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.									13,883,620		
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.									306,809		
Kansas City, St. Jo & Council Bluffs.									1,048,238		
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.									1,799,161		
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.		492	88	935	148		278	3,633	34,902	26,281	8,621
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.									30,510	20,058	10,452
Chicago Great Western.		8,253	5,463	9,331	13,535	8,855	185,944	138,838	1,719,854		
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.	*209,088	177,590	63,736	260,643	59,611	289,868	1,052,323	517,638	18,330,156	14,003,142	1,825,014
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.	25,483	17,010	35,384	44,502	45,690	13,033	725,827	8,945	7,053,249		
Chicago & North-Western.	28,565	174,185	241,350	185,769	186,414	450,732	1,259,901	714,106	21,551,134	18,448,723	3,102,411
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.		28,693	11,044	18,104	23,704		288,945	447,721	4,740,196	8,837,158	1,203,040
Sioux City & Pacific.	203	5,038	3,769	1,723	4,540	63	38,579	6,800	515,451	217,878	297,576
Crooked Creek.	244	2					209	6,737	16,626	16,604	1,052
Des Moines, Northern & Western.		2,736	1,284	3,152	2,854	2,370	26,136	5,089	348,087	255,810	92,277
Dubuque & Sioux City.	3,109	4,522	3,578	3,956	4,017	2,185	28,710	94,181	1,140,656	706,041	344,917
Stacyville railroad.		88	41	1	40		253	1,490	13,699	9,598	4,101
Des Moines Union.											
Iowa Central.	2,787	6,848	4,111	7,078	4,780	3,161	63,607	87,459	1,548,411	1,014,239	534,172
Albia & Centerville.	96	10	37		47		1,370	415	136,750	132,916	3,774
Iowa Northern.									178,799	178,799	
Keokuk & Western.		1,272	813	833	1,845		19,210	8,650	261,739	211,857	49,882
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.		753	470	878	614		4,798	8,098	191,553	108,171	23,382
Minneapolis & St. Louis.		24,435	3,498	5,924	2,254		90,098	52,368	1,585,378	894,531	690,747
Muscatine North & South.	27	26	10		10		1,136	1,660	17,354	13,300	
Omaha & St. Louis.		1,404	780	715	1,613		16,919	13,851	301,796	106,454	195,342
Sioux City & Northern.		1,064	558	659	287		11,183	4,481	268,398	135,136	133,262
Taber & Northern.											
Union Pacific.											
Wabash.		31,879	13,802	65,990	18,994		454,745	873,809	6,987,841		
Winona & Western.		856	2,599	62	438		7,782	1,575	123,413	94,655	27,758
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.											
Burlington & Northwestern.											
Burlington & Western.									74,708	33,436	41,272
									90,214	18,844	71,370
Total.	209,653	660,684	419,559	850,425	412,656	764,003	4,766,577	3,847,580	91,640,698	46,850,652	11,390,354

\* Iron and steel.

TABLE 66—CONSUMPTION OF FUEL BY LOCOMOTIVES—IOWA.

RAILROADS.	BITUMINOUS COAL.		WOOD.				Total fuel consumed—tons.	Miles run.	Average pounds consumed per mile.
	Tons.	Average cost.	HARD.		SOFT.				
			Cords.	Cost.	Cords.	Cost.			
Ames & College.									
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.									
Boone Valley.									
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.	140,339.00	\$1.50			542.00	\$2.00	140,610.00	3,500,697	80.00
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.	685.00	2.75					685.00	9,320	144.00
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.	826,775.50	1.28			10,857.00	1.10	837,648.50	19,233,009	86.58
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.	18,147.00	1.26			90.00	1.78	18,191.00	476,033	76.43
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.	73,522.50	1.75			927.75	2.12	73,986.48	1,861,687	79.43
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.	75,688.00	1.38			623.00	1.13	75,999.50	2,130,482	71.34
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.	4,155.00	1.40				3.20	4,184.50	92,154	90.66
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.	1,900.00	1.40						32,448	83.12
Chicago Great Western.									
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.									
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.									
Chicago & North-Western.									
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.									
Sioux City & Pacific.									
Crooked Creek.									
Des Moines Northern & Western.									
Dubuque & Sioux City.									
Stacyville railroad.									
Des Moines Union.									
Iowa Central.									
Albia & Centerville.									
Iowa Northern.									
Keokuk & Western.									
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.									
Minneapolis & St. Louis.									
Muscatine North & South.									
Omaha & St. Louis.									
Sioux City & Northern.									
Taber & Northern.									
Union Pacific.									
*Wabash.									
Winona & Western.									
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.									
Burlington & Northwestern.									
Burlington & Western.									
Total.									

\* Entire line.



TABLE 67—TONNAGE CROSSING MISSISSIPPI AND MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGES.

RAILROADS.	MISSISSIPPI RIVER.				MISSOURI RIVER.			
	Location of bridge.	East bound.	West bound.	Total.	Location of bridge.	East bound.	West bound.	Total.
Ames & College.....								
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	Fort Madison...	470,364	408,730	879,094				
Boone Valley.....								
Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....								
Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....								
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy.....	Burlington.....	1,034,336	1,027,720	2,062,056	Nebraska City- Plattsmouth...	85,328	87,199	180,461
Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City.....						665,283	712,350	1,377,613
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs.....								
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern.....								
Chicago, Ft. Madison & Des Moines.....								
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota.....								
Chicago Great Western.....	Dubuque.....	682,897	455,226	1,138,123				
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	Sabula.....	1,479,053	1,170,751	2,649,804				
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	North McGregor.....	244,816	176,037	420,853	Council Bluffs..	236,152	243,730	479,882
Chicago & North-Western.....	Davenport.....	1,538,312	894,574	2,432,886				
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha.....	Clinton.....	2,294,842	1,030,963	3,315,806				
Sioux City & Pacific.....					Sioux City.....	287,566	214,707	502,213
Crooked Creek.....					Blair.....	67,088	76,018	143,116
Des Moines Northern & Western.....								
Dubuque & Sioux City.....	Dubuque.....	519,225	300,691	820,016				
Stacyville railroad.....								
Des Moines Union.....								
Iowa Central.....	Keithsburg.....	396,641	251,327	647,968				
Iowa & Centerville.....								
Iowa Northern.....								
Keokuk & Western.....								
Mason City & Ft. Dodge.....								
Minneapolis & St. Louis.....								
Muscatine North & South.....								
Omaha & St. Louis.....								
Sioux City & Northern.....								
Tabor & Northern.....								
Union Pacific.....					Council Bluffs..	581,820	406,688	988,508
Wabash.....								
Winona & Western.....								
NARROW GAUGE ROADS.								
Burlington & Northwestern.....								
Burlington & Western.....								
Total.....		8,590,686	5,706,059	14,296,745		1,931,101	1,740,692	3,671,793

TABLE 68—ACCIDENTS—STATE OF IOWA.

[illegible]



---

MILEAGE, OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
OF  
RAILWAY COMPANIES.

---



# MILEAGE, OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF RAILWAY COMPANIES.

## AMES & COLLEGE RAILWAY COMPANY.

PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each class of 1st named.
	FROM—	TO—	
Ames & College railway.....	Ames.....	College.....	1.98

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	W. M. Greeley.....	Ames, Iowa.
President.....	W. M. Greeley.....	Ames, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	E. W. Stanton.....	Ames, Iowa.
Secretary.....	M. K. Smith.....	Ames, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	M. K. Smith.....	Ames, Iowa.
General Manager.....	M. K. Smith.....	Ames, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
W. M. Greeley.....	Ames, Iowa.	M. Stalker.....	Ames, Iowa.
E. W. Stanton.....	Ames, Iowa.	C. F. Curtiss.....	Ames, Iowa.
M. K. Smith.....	Ames, Iowa.	G. H. France.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
J. L. Budd.....	Ames, Iowa.		

## ATCHISON, TOPEKA & SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY.

PROPERTY OPERATED.

- Railroad line represented by capital stock { *a* Main line.  
*b* Branches and spurs.
- Proprietary companies whose entire capital stock is owned by this company.
- Line operated under contract, or where the rental is contingent upon earnings or other considerations.
- Line operated under trackage rights.



## ATCHISON, TOPEKA &amp; SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY.—CONTINUED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each claim of damages.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. a The Atchison, Topeka & S. F. Ry. Co. b The Atchison, Topeka & S. F. Ry. Co.	*Chicago (Els. Jc) *Ancona, Ill. La Junta, Col. Newton, Kan. Holliday, Kan. No Lexington, Mo. Atchison, Kan. Wildor, Kan. Lawrence, Kan. No. Ottawa, Kan. Burlingame, Kan. Osage City, Kan. Burlington Jc, Ks. Colony, Kan. Chanute, Kan. Frontenac, Kan. Cherry Vale, Kan. Chanute, Kan. Benedict, Kan. Independence, Ks. Emporia, Kan. Ellinor, Kan. Gladstone, Kan. Wichita, Kan. Abilene, Kan. Manchester, Kan. Florence, Kan. Augusta, Kan. Mulvane, Kan. Wellington, Kan. Attica, Kan. Mulvane, Kan. Florence, Kan. Little River, Kan. Hutchinson, Kan. Great Bend, Kan. Larned, Kan. Pueblo, Col. Dillon, N. M. Las Vegas, N. M. Lamy, N. M. Socorro, N. M. Bincan, N. M. Nutt, N. M. Deming, N. M. Whitewater, N. M.	N. M. & Tex line. Eekin, Ill. Denver, Col. Purcell, I. T. I. T. & Tex. line. Winthrop, Mo. Topeka, Kan. Hawthorne, Kan. No. Ottawa, Kan. Emporia, Kan. Alma, Kan. Quenemo, Kan. Gridley, Kan. Yates Center, Ks. Pittsburg, Kan. Midway, Kan. Coffeyville, Kan. Longton, Kan. Madison Jc, Kan. Cedar Vale, Kan. Moline, Kan. Bazar, Kan. Neb. state line. Pratt, Kan. Salina, Kan. Barnard, Kan. Winfield, Kan. Mulvane, Kan. Oaldwell, Kan. Hunnewell, Kan. Medicine Lodge K. Englewood, Kan. Ellenwood, Kan. Holyrood, Kan. Kinsley, Kan. Scott City, Kan. Jctmore, Kan. Canon City, Col. Blissburg, N. M. Hot Springs, N. M. Santa Fe, N. M. Magdalena, N. M. Deming, N. M. Lake Valley, N. M. Silver City, N. M. San Jose, N. M.	1,595.10 52.40 182.97 233.90 97.56 442.83 50.54 46.19 26.24 56.42 34.52 20.41 52.74 35.27 61.08 1.73 18.09 44.54 41.11 55.83 84.38 10.00 162.88 79.77 23.56 43.08 72.73 20.80 42.55 18.41 21.26 166.28 95.84 26.74 84.43 120.39 48.80 47.35 5.93 8.27 18.30 30.96 54.44 13.31 48.30 14.68	4,502.91
2. Kansas & Southeastern railroad. The S. K. Railway Co. of Texas. R. G. & E. P. railroad. The Santa Rita railroad.	Hunnewell, Kan. I. T. & Tex. line. N. M. & Tex. line. San Jose, N. M.	Bramen, O. T. Pan Handle, Tex. El Paso, Tex. Santa Rita, N. M.	8.26 100.41 20.15 3.98	132.80
4. Ft. Worth & Denver City railroad. 5. Fremont, E. & M. V. railroad. Chicago & G. T. Jct. railroad. Chicago & W. I. railroad. Toledo, Peoria & Western railway. Kansas City Belt railway. F. W. & D. O. railroad.	Pan Handle, Tex. Neb. state line. Terminal, Chgo. Terminal, Chgo. Streator Jct., Ill. Big Blue Jct., Mo. Washburn, Tex.	Washburn, Tex. Superior, Neb. Terminal, Chgo. Terminal, Chgo. Pekin Jct., Ill. Kansas City, Mo. Amarillo, Tex.	2.53 3.02 4.84 5.91 6.44 14.04	37.88
Total				4,687.81

\*Exclusive of 5.44 miles of rented track between Big Blue Junction and Kansas City, Mo.  
†Exclusive of 5.91 miles of rented track between Streator Junction and Pekin Junction.

Miles operated June 30, 1898.....

4,564.73

## ADDED DURING FISCAL YEAR.

San Jose to Santa Rita, N. M. (Dec. 1, 1898), miles.....	3.93
Whitewater to San Jose, N. M. (Dec. 1, 1898), miles.....	.03
Wichita to Pratt, Kan (Jan. 1, 1899), miles.....	79.77
Holy to Bramen, O. T. (March 1, 1899), miles.....	8.50
Less deducted on account of error (April 1, 1899), miles.....	.24
	8.26
Burlingame to Alma, Kan. (April 1, 1899), miles.....	34.52
	126.61

## LESS TAKEN UP DURING FISCAL YEAR.

Holyrood to west line of county (Sept. 1, 1898), miles.....	3.53
	123.08

Miles operated June 30, 1899.....  
Average miles operated during fiscal year, 4,615.45.  
Proportion for Iowa, 19.86 miles, includes .10 miles of Mississippi river bridge.  
Average miles operated, main line, during the year, 4,615.45.

4,687.81

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	Aldace F. Walker.....	New York.
President.....	E. P. Ripley.....	Chicago.
First Vice-President and General Solicitor.....	E. D. Kenna.....	Chicago.
Second Vice-President.....	Paul Morton.....	Chicago.
Secretary and Treasurer.....	E. Wilder.....	Topeka.
Assistant Secretary.....	L. O. Deming.....	New York.
Assistant Treasurer.....	H. W. Gardiner.....	New York.
General Counsel.....	Victor Morawetz.....	New York.
Comptroller.....	J. P. Whitehead.....	New York.
General Auditor.....	H. C. Whitehead.....	Chicago.
Freight Traffic Manager.....	W. B. Biddle.....	Chicago.
Assistant Traffic Manager.....	W. A. Bissell.....	San Francisco.
General Freight Agent.....	F. C. Gay.....	Topeka.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	C. R. Hudson.....	Topeka.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	J. E. Gorman.....	Chicago.
Passenger Traffic Manager.....	J. W. Tedford.....	Chicago.
General Passenger Agent.....	Geo. T. Nicholson.....	Chicago.
Assistant General Passenger Agent.....	W. J. Black.....	Chicago.
General Baggage Agent.....	O. A. Higgins.....	Chicago.
Auditor of Disbursements.....	P. Walsh.....	Topeka.
Auditor of Freight Receipts.....	I. S. Lauck.....	Topeka.
Auditor of Passenger Receipts.....	C. S. Sutton.....	Topeka.
General Purchasing Agent.....	C. M. Atwood.....	Chicago.
General Manager.....	W. E. Hodges.....	Chicago.
Chief Engineer.....	J. J. Frey.....	Topeka.
General Superintendent.....	Jan Dun.....	Topeka.
Assistant General Superintendent.....	H. U. Mudge.....	Topeka.
Signal Engineer.....	Avery Turner.....	Topeka.
Superintendent of Machinery.....	J. S. Hobson.....	Topeka.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	John Player.....	Topeka.
Superintendent of Car Service.....	C. W. Kouns.....	Topeka.
General Claim Agent.....	C. G. Sholes.....	Topeka.
Tax Commissioner.....	E. T. Cartledge.....	Topeka.
Chief Surgeon.....	J. P. Kaster, M. D.....	Topeka.



BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} a \text{ Main line.} \\ b \text{ Branches and spurs.} \end{array} \right.$
2. Proprietary companies whose entire capital stock is owned by this company.
3. Line operated under contract, or where the rental is contingent upon earnings or other considerations.
4. Line operated under trackage rights.

1. Total number of stockholders at date of last election, 13,534.
2. Date of last meeting of stockholders for election of directors, December 8, 1898.
3. Postoffice address of general office, Topeka, Kan.
4. Postoffice address of operating office, Topeka, Kan.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of r named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. Burlington, Ced. Rap. & Northern Ry.—				
<i>a</i> Main line.....	Burlington, Iowa	Albert Lea, Minn.	94.13	241.85
<i>b</i> Milwaukee division.....	Linn Jct., Iowa.....	Postville, Iowa.....	30.58	
Muscatine division.....	Muscatine, Iowa.....	Riverside, Iowa.....	30.58	
Pacific division.....	Vinton, Iowa.....	Holland, Iowa.....	48.12	172.85
Davenport division.....	Bennett, Iowa.....	Davenport, Iowa.....	31.51	31.51
2. Iowa City & Western railway.....	Iowa City, Iowa.....	What Cheer, Iowa.....	57.23	
<i>a</i> Montezuma branch.....	Thornburg, Iowa.....	Montezuma, Ia.....	5.30	73.09
3. Cedar Rapids, Iowa Falls & N. W. Ry.....	Holland, Iowa.....	Watertown, S. D.....		327.98
<i>a</i> Dows extension.....	Dows, Iowa.....	Armstrong, Iowa.....	91.26	
Hayfield branch.....	Garner, Iowa.....	Madison Jct., Ia.....	6.45	
<i>b</i> Sioux Falls extension.....	Ellsworth, Minn.....	Sioux Falls, S. D.....	17.65	
Lake Park.....	Lake Park, Iowa.....	Worthingt'n, Minn.....	47.05	
Trosky.....	Trosky, Minn.....	Jasper, Minn.....	9.18	167.00
2. Cedar Rapids & Clinton railway.....	Iowa City, Iowa.....	Clinton, Iowa.....	79.20	
<i>a</i> Quarry line.....	Near Plato, Iowa.....	Quarry, Iowa.....	7.74	81.94
3. Chicago, Decora & Minnesota railway.....	Postville Jct., Ia.....	Decora, Iowa.....	23.30	23.30
4. Waverly Short line.....	Near Winslow, Ia.....	Waverly, Iowa.....	5.68	5.68
5. Iowa Central railway.....	Manly Jct., Ia.....	Northwood, Ia.....	11.99	11.99
Total.....				1,196.47

a Length of main line is 253.21 miles, including the 11.39 miles from Manly Junction to Northwood, leased from the Iowa Central Railway company; these deducted from the 253.21 leaves 241.82 miles owned by the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway company.

OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	R. E. Cable.....	Chicago, Ill.
President.....	C. J. Ives.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	Robert Williams.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Secretary.....	S. S. Dorwart.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	H. B. Holsted.....	New York, N. Y.
Assistant Treasurer.....	S. S. Dorwart.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
General Solicitor.....	S. K. Tracy.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
General Auditor.....	J. C. Broeksmit.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Ticket Auditor.....	G. C. Gillilan.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Chief Auditor.....	W. F. Broeksmit.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Chief Engineer.....	H. B. White.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
General Superintendent.....	Robert Williams.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Superintendent.....	George A. Goodell.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Assistant Superintendent.....	P. A. Murphy.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Division Superintendent.....	W. F. Ward.....	Estherville, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	T. S. Spaford.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
General Passenger Agent.....	J. Merton.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
General Ticket Agent.....	J. Merton.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
General Baggage Agent.....	J. Merton.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

General Ticket Agent.....	J. Morton.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
General Baggage Agent.....	J. Morton.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.



## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Geo. W. Cable.....	Davenport, Iowa.	Robert Mather.....	Chicago, Ill.
Thomas Hedge.....	Burlington, Iowa.	R. B. Cable.....	Chicago, Ill.
J. Carskadden.....	Muscatine, Iowa.	C. F. Squire.....	Burlington, Iowa.
C. J. Ives.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.	William Carson.....	Burlington, Iowa.
J. C. Peaseley.....	Chicago, Ill.	F. H. Griggs.....	Davenport, Iowa.
J. W. Rhyth.....	Burlington, Iowa.	A. Kimball.....	Davenport, Iowa.
W. G. Purdy.....	Chicago, Ill.		

## CEDAR RAPIDS, GARNER &amp; NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock.
5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.
	FROM—	TO—	
1. Cedar Rapids, Garner & Northwestern.....	Hayfield Junct..	Titonka.....	18.88
5. Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern.....	Hayfield Junct..	Garner.....	8.00

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	A. C. Ripley.....	Garner, Iowa.
President.....	A. C. Ripley.....	Garner, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	J. N. Spole.....	Garner, Iowa.
Secretary.....	H. H. Bush.....	Garner, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	H. N. Brockway.....	Garner, Iowa.
Auditor.....	A. F. Brownell.....	Garner, Iowa.
General Superintendent.....	E. P. Fox.....	Garner, Iowa.
Traffic Manager.....	A. F. Brownell.....	Garner, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
A. C. Ripley.....	Garner, Iowa.	E. P. Fox.....	Garner, Iowa.
J. N. Spole.....	Garner, Iowa.	M. A. Fell.....	Garner, Iowa.
H. N. Brockway.....	Garner, Iowa.	William Shattuck.....	Garner, Iowa.
O. S. Terwilliger.....	Garner, Iowa.	E. C. Abbey.....	Garner, Iowa.
J. E. Wichmon.....	Garner, Iowa.		

## CHICAGO, BURLINGTON &amp; QUINCY RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock { a Main line.
5. Line operated under trackage rights. { b Branches and spurs.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Millions of line for each class of roads named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. a Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroad.....	Chicago, Ill.	Pacific Junction, Iowa.....	482.70	890.81
Burlington & Missouri River railroad in Nebraska.....	Galesburg, Ill.	Quincy, Ill.	100.05	
1. b Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroad.....	Galesburg, Ill.	Peoria, Ill.	52.77	
Peoria & Hannibal railroad.....	Pacific Junction, Iowa.....	Kearney, Neb.	195.20	
Chicago & Iowa railroad.....	Aurora, Ill.	West Chicago, Ill.	12.35	
Ottawa, Oswego & Fox River railroad.....	Yves City, Ill.	Lebanon, Mo.	30.13	
Illinois Valley & Northern railroad.....	Lawson, Ill.	Rushville, Ill.	32.60	
Chicago & Rock River railroad.....	South Aurora, Ill.	Forreston, Ill.	78.44	
Chicago & Rock River railroad.....	Flag Center, Ill.	Rockford, Ill.	83.50	
Illinois Grand Trunk railroad.....	Geneva, Ill.	Streator, Ill.	87.25	
Dixon, Peoria & Hannibal railroad.....	Streator, Ill.	Walnut, Ill.	58.76	
Galesburg & Rio railroad.....	Shabbona, Ill.	Sterling, Ill.	47.86	
American Central railroad.....	Sheridan, Ill.	Lawson, Ill.	55.34	
Dixon & Quincy railroad.....	Buda, Ill.	Rockford, Ill.	65.35	
Quincy & Burlington railroad.....	Galesburg, Ill.	Elmwood, Ill.	44.51	
Quincy & Hannibal railroad.....	Galva, Ill.	Rio, Ill.	12.32	
St. Louis, Rock Island & Chicago railroad.....	Keithsburg Junction, Ill.	New Boston, Ill.	50.63	
Quincy, Alton & St. Louis railway.....	Carthage, Ill.	Keithsburg, Ill.	6.25	
Albia, Knoxville & Des Moines railroad.....	Carthage, Ill.	Quincy, Ill.	70.30	
Des Moines & Knoxville railroad.....	Rock Island, Ill.	East Alton, Ill.	40.44	
Burlington & Missouri River railroad.....	Gladstone, Ill.	Keithsburg, Ill.	227.71	
Leon, Mt. Ayr & Northwestern railroad.....	Quincy, Ill.	East Hannibal, Ill.	17.13	
St. Joseph & Des Moines railroad.....	Albia, Iowa.	East Hannibal, Ill.	46.36	
	Knoxville, Iowa.	Des Moines, Iowa.	32.97	
	Chariton, Iowa.	Des Moines, Iowa.	34.97	
	Osceola, Mo.	Des Moines, Iowa.	42.75	
	Red Oak, Iowa.	Des Moines, Iowa.	39.17	
	Leon, Iowa.	Hannibal, Mo.	39.17	
	Bethany Junction, Iowa.	Grant City, Mo.	57.72	
	Albany, Mo.	Albany, Mo.	46.22	
	St. Joseph, Mo.	St. Joseph, Mo.	45.09	



## CHICAGO, BURLINGTON &amp; QUINCY RAILROAD COMPANY—CONTINUED.

## PROPERTY OPERATED—CONTINUED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of roads named.
	FROM—	TO—		
Chariton, Des Moines & Southern railroad.....	Chariton, Iowa.....	Indianola, Iowa.....	33.16	
Creston & Northern railroad.....	Creston, Iowa.....	Pontanelle, Iowa.....	27.50	
Western Iowa railroad.....	Fontanelle, Iowa.....	Cumberland, Iowa.....	20.33	
Brownville & Nodaway Valley railroad.....	Villisca, Iowa.....	Burlington Junction, Mo.....	35.00	
Clarinda, College Springs & Southwestern railroad.....	Clarinda, Iowa.....	Northboro, Iowa.....	15.89	
Red Oak & Atlantic railroad.....	Red Oak, Iowa.....	Griswold, Iowa.....	18.04	
Nebraska City, Sidney & Northeastern railroad.....	Hastings, Iowa.....	Sidney, Iowa.....	21.12	
Hastings & A. Voca railroad.....	Hastings, Iowa.....	Carson, Iowa.....	15.79	
Keokuk & St. Paul railroad.....	Burlington, Iowa.....	Keokuk, Iowa.....	42.33	
Humeston & Shenandoah railroad.....	Van Wert, Iowa.....	Shenandoah, Iowa.....	95.45	
Chicago, Burlington & Northern railroad.....	Oregon, Ill.....	St. Paul, Minn.....	319.04	
	Fulton, Ill.....	Savanna, Ill.....	16.72	
	Galeana Junction, Ill.....	Galeana, Ill.....	3.82	
	East Winona, Wis.....	Winona, Minn.....	1.34	
	At Dubuque, Iowa.....		.53	
Republican Valley railroad.....	York, Neb.....	Central City, Neb.....	41.85	
	Nemaha, Neb.....	Salem, Neb.....	17.00	
	Nemaha, Neb.....	Beatrice, Neb.....	14.34	
	Beatrice, Neb.....	Wymore, Neb.....	11.87	
	Hastings, Neb.....	Colorado State Line.....	230.41	
	Aurora, Neb.....	Grand Island, Neb.....	18.51	
	Aurora, Neb.....	Hastings, Neb.....	27.75	
Omaha & Southwestern railroad.....	Table Rock, Neb.....	Amboy, Neb.....	142.84	
	Omaha, Neb.....	Orenopolis, Neb.....	19.88	
Nebraska railway.....	Crete, Neb.....	Beatrice, Neb.....	30.00	
	Nemaha, Neb.....	York, Neb.....	135.78	
Lincoln & Northwestern railroad.....	Nebraska City Bridge line.....		3.12	
Atchison & Nebraska railroad.....	Lincoln, Neb.....	Columbus, Neb.....	144.05	
	Atchison, Kan.....	Lincoln, Neb.....	144.05	
	Rulo Bridge line.....		3.42	
St. Joseph & Nebraska railroad.....	Napier, Mo.....	Boswell, Mo.....	5.86	
Nebraska & Colorado railroad.....	Chester, Neb.....	Fairmont, Neb.....	45.19	
	Kenesaw, Neb.....	Oxford, Neb.....	60.67	
	Dewitt, Neb.....	Colorado State Line.....	298.33	
	Edgar, Neb.....	Superior, Neb.....	39.53	
Chicago, Nebraska & Kansas railroad.....	Odell Junction, Neb.....	Concordia, Kan.....	71.04	
Republican Valley, Kansas & Southwestern railroad.....	Republican, Neb.....	Oberlin, Kan.....	78.23	
Oxford & Kansas railroad.....	Orleans, Neb.....	Kansas State Line.....	59.61	
Burlington & Colorado railroad.....	Colorado State Line, Neb.....	Denver, Col.....	174.89	
Colorado & Wyoming railroad.....	Colorado State Line, Neb.....	Wyoming State Line, Col.....	144.58	
Cheyenne & Burlington railroad.....	Colorado State Line, Wyo.....	Cheyenne, Wyo.....	29.01	
Beaver Valley railroad.....	Nebraska State Line.....	St. Francis, Kan.....	74.18	
Lincoln & Black Hills railroad.....	Central City, Neb.....	Erickson, Neb.....	63.94	
	Greeley Center, Neb.....	Burwell, Neb.....	40.38	
	Palmer, Neb.....	Arcadia, Neb.....	54.02	
Grand Island & Wyoming Central railroad.....	Grand Island, Neb.....	Wyoming State Line, S. D.....	401.32	
	Edgemont Junction, S. D.....	Deadwood, S. D.....	106.40	
	Minnekahta, S. D.....	Hot Springs, S. D.....	13.34	
	Englewood, S. D.....	Spearfish, S. D.....	31.91	
Grand Island & Northern Wyoming railroad.....	Wyoming State Line, S. D.....	Montana State Line, Wyo.....	229.59	
	Newcastle, Wyo.....	Cambria, Wyo.....	7.00	
Big Horn Southern railroad.....	Montana State Line, Wyo.....	Huntley, Mont.....	101.74	
Denver, Utah & Pacific railroad.....	Denver, Col.....	Utah Junction, Col.....	3.00	
Republican Valley & Wyoming railroad.....	Burns Junction, Col.....	Lyons Tower, Col.....	32.67	
Omaha & North Platte railroad.....	On'bertson, Neb.....	Imperial, Neb.....	49.17	
	Omaha, Neb.....	Schuyler, Neb.....	80.59	5,209.52
5. Pennsylvania company.....	At Chicago.....		1.22	
Chicago & North-Western railway.....	At Clinton, Iowa and Illinois.....		1.22	
Quincy Bridge & Railway.....	At Quincy, Ill.....		1.33	
Wabash railroad.....	East Hannibal, Ill.....	Hannibal, Mo.....	2.07	
Chicago & Alton railroad.....	East Louisiana, Ill.....	Louisiana, Mo.....	2.07	
Indianapolis & St. Louis railroad.....	Alton, Ill.....	East St. Louis, Ill.....	22.30	
Keokuk & Western railroad.....	Van Wert, Iowa.....	Humeston, Iowa.....	17.08	
St. Clair, Madison & St. Louis Belt railroad.....	Alton, Ill.....	West Alton, Mo.....	2.75	
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern railroad.....	West Alton, Mo.....	St. Louis, Mo.....	16.52	
Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs railroad.....	Pacific Junction, Iowa.....	Council Bluffs, Iowa.....	6.97	
	Hamburg, Iowa.....	Nebraska City Junction, Iowa.....	1.86	
	State Line, Iowa.....	Hopkins, Mo.....	1.93	
	At Northboro, Iowa.....		3.65	
	Nebraska City Bridge Con.....	Nebraska City, Neb.....	37.28	
	Napier, Mo.....	St. Joseph, Mo.....	11.30	
St. Louis Merchants Bridge & Terminal railroad.....	At St. Louis, Mo.....	Burns Junction, Col.....	12.62	
Colorado & Southern railway.....	Utah Junction, Col.....	Billings, Mont.....	.07	
Northern Pacific railroad.....	Huntley, Mont.....		.25	
Hannibal & St. Joseph railroad.....	At St. Joseph, Mo.....		.15	
Missouri, Kansas & Texas railway.....	At Hannibal, Mo.....		.15	
Hannibal M. D. company.....	At Hannibal, Mo.....		.15	
Illinois Central railroad.....	Portage Curve, Ill.....	East Dubuque, Ill.....	13.25	
Danielth & Dubuque bridge.....	East Dubuque, Ill.....	Dubuque, Iowa.....	3.38	
St. Paul M. D. company.....	At St. Paul, Minn.....		11.65	
Great Northern Railway line.....	St. Paul, Minn.....	Minneapolis, Minn.....	2.21	
Minneapolis Union railway.....	At Minneapolis.....		.98	
Winona Bridge & Railway.....	East Winona, Wis.....	Winona, Minn.....		190.60
Total mileage operated.....				6,230.62



## CHICAGO, BURLINGTON &amp; QUINCY RAILROAD CO.—CONTINUED.

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	Francis W. Hunnewell.	Boston, Mass.
President.....	O. E. Perkins.....	Burlington, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	J. C. Peasley.....	Chicago, Ill.
Second Vice-President.....	George B. Harris.....	Chicago, Ill.
Secretary.....	T. H. Howland.....	Boston, Mass.
Treasurer.....	J. C. Peasley.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Solicitor.....	J. W. Blythe.....	Burlington, Iowa.
General Auditor.....	O. I. Sturgis.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Manager.....	W. C. Brown.....	Chicago, Ill.
Chief Engineer.....	W. L. Breckenridge.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Superintendent.....	J. D. Besler.....	Chicago, Ill.
Superintendent Iowa lines.....	O. M. Levey.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Division Superintendent.....	O. E. Stewart.....	Ottumwa, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	J. H. Duggan.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Freight Agent.....	W. W. Ryder.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	Thomas Miller.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	W. B. Hamblin.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Passenger and Ticket Agent.....	E. R. Puffer.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Passenger and Ticket Agent.....	P. S. Eustis.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Baggage Agent.....	W. A. Lalor.....	Chicago, Ill.
Land Commissioner.....	E. A. Sudd.....	Chicago, Ill.
	W. W. Baldwin.....	Burlington, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Francis W. Hunnewell.....	Boston, Mass.	William Endicott, Jr.....	Boston, Mass.
John N. A. Griswold.....	New York, N. Y.	Richard Olney.....	Boston, Mass.
Charles J. Palmer.....	Boston, Mass.	Edw. W. Hooper.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Charles E. Perkins.....	Burlington, Iowa.	James H. Smith.....	New York, N. Y.
T. Jefferson Coolidge.....	Manchester, Mass.	J. Malcolm Forbes.....	Boston, Mass.
George P. Gardner.....	Boston, Mass.		

## CHICAGO, BURLINGTON &amp; KANSAS CITY RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock { a Main line.  
b Branches and spurs.
2. Proprietary companies whose entire capital stock is owned by this company.
3. Line operated under lease for specified sum.
5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of road named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. Chicago, Burlington & Kansas City Ry.	Viele, Iowa.....	Bloomfield, Iowa.....	59.79	181.56
	Moulton, Iowa..	Carrollton, Mo..	121.77	
5. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroad.	Burlington, Iowa.....	Viele, Iowa.....	25.28	39.39
Wabash railroad.....	Bloomfield.....	Moulton, Iowa..	14.11	
Total.....				220.95

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	W. W. Baldwin.....	Burlington, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	J. P. Peasley.....	Chicago, Ill.
Second Vice-President.....	Geo. B. Harris.....	Chicago, Ill.
Secretary.....	H. E. Jarvis.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	J. C. Peasley.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Solicitor.....	Spencer & Mosman.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Attorney.....	H. H. Trimble.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
General Auditor.....	C. I. Sturgis.....	Chicago, Ill.
Auditor.....	O. M. Carter.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Assistant Auditor.....	Ben L. Crosby.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
General Manager.....	Howard Elliott.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Chief Engineer.....	L. F. Goodale.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
General Superintendent.....	S. E. Crause.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Superintendent.....	W. E. Cunningham.....	Hannibal, Mo.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	T. J. Lowrie.....	Hannibal, Mo.
General Freight Agent.....	D. O. Ives.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	Wm. Gray.....	St. Louis, Mo.
General Passenger Agent.....	L. W. Wakeley.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant General Passenger Agent.....	C. L. Grice.....	St. Louis, Mo.
General Baggage Agent.....	E. A. Sudd.....	Chicago, Ill.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
W. W. Baldwin.....	Burlington, Iowa.	W. F. McFarland.....	Burlington, Iowa.
H. B. Scott.....	Burlington, Iowa.	J. C. Peasley.....	Burlington, Iowa.
J. W. Blythe.....	Burlington, Iowa.		

## KANSAS CITY, ST. JO &amp; COUNCIL BLUFFS RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock { a Main line.  
b Branches and spurs.
2. Proprietary companies whose entire capital stock is owned by this company.
3. Line operated under lease for specified sum.
4. Line operated under contract, or where the rental is contingent upon earnings or other considerations.
5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of road named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. Kansas City, St. Jo & Co. Bluffs R. R.....	Through Kansas City yard.....	Co. Bluffs, Iowa.	.44	189.81
a Main line.....	Harlem, Mo.....		189.37	
b Branch lines.....	E. Leavenworth. Stillings.....		1.05	54.45
	Armour..... Winthrop.....		2.96	
	Amazonia..... Hopkins.....		50.44	50.15
2. Nodaway Valley railroad.....	Bigelow.....	Burlington Jct.....	31.54	
Tarkio Valley railroad.....	Corning.....	Northboro.....	27.61	
3. None.				6.09
4. None.				
5. Hannibal & St. Jo railroad.....	Kan. City U. D.....	Harlem.....	1.72	6.09
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroad.....	Council Bluffs.....	U. P. Transfer..	1.57	
Leav. Bridge & Terminal company.....	Stillings.....	Leavenworth.....	1.73	309.50
Atchison U. D. & R. R. company.....	Winthrop.....	Atchison U. D.....	1.07	
Total.....				309.50



## KANSAS CITY, ST. JO &amp; COUNCIL BLUFFS RAILROAD CO.—CONTINUED.

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	C. E. Perkins.....	Burlington, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	J. C. Peasley.....	Chicago, Ill.
Second Vice-President.....	Geo. B. Harris.....	Chicago, Ill.
Secretary.....	T. S. Howland.....	Boston, Mass.
Treasurer.....	J. C. Peasley.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Solicitors.....	Spencer & Mosman.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
General Auditor.....	C. I. Sturgis.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Auditor.....	C. M. Carter.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Auditor.....	B. L. Crosby.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Assistant Auditor.....	Howard Elliott.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
General Manager.....	L. F. Goodale.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Chief Engineer.....	S. E. Crance.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
General Superintendent.....	G. M. Hohl.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Superintendent.....	E. G. Fish.....	Kansas City, Mo.
Assistant Superintendent.....	I. T. Dyer.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	D. O. Ives.....	St. Louis, Mo.
General Freight Agent.....	Wm. Gray.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	L. W. Wakeley.....	St. Louis, Mo.
General Passenger Agent.....	C. L. Grice.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant General Passenger Agent.....	E. A. Sudd.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Baggage Agent.....		

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
C. E. Perkins.....	Burlington, Iowa.	Howard Elliott.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
F. W. Hunnewell.....	Boston, Mass.	O. M. Spencer.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
J. Malcolm Forbes.....	Boston, Mass.	C. M. Carter.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
C. J. Paine.....	Boston, Mass.	T. J. Coolidge.....	Manchester, Mass.
Richard Olney.....	Boston, Mass.		

## ST. LOUIS, KEOKUK &amp; NORTHWESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock { a Main line.  
b Branches and spurs.  
5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of road named.
	FROM—	TO—		
I. a St. Louis, Keok. & N.-W. R. R. Co.....	Keokuk, Iowa.....	W. Quincy, Mo.....	36.66	166.74
	Moody, Mo.....	Hannibal, Mo.....	13.25	
	Hannibal, Mo.....	Louisiana, Mo.....	25.32	
	Louisiana, Mo.....	Ft. Lincoln, St. L.....	91.51	
b St. Louis, Keok. & N.-W. R. R. Co.....	Culvre Jct., Mo.....	St. Peters, Mo.....	10.55	59.06
	Mt. Pis. Jct., Ia.....	Keokuk, Iowa.....	48.01	
	At West Alton.....		.46	
	At N. M. St., St. L.....	St. Louis, Mo.....	.04	
5. Q. B. Co. and C. B. & Q. R. R.....	W. Quincy, Mo.....	Quincy, Ill.....	2.03	38.74
Hannibal & St. Joseph Railroad Co.....	W. Quincy, Mo.....	Moody, Mo.....	4.07	
Wabash Railroad company.....	Hannibal, Mo.....	Hannibal, Mo.....	.42	
Missouri, Kansas & Texas Ry. Co.....	Hannibal, Mo.....	Hannibal, Mo.....	.32	
Chicago & Alton Railroad company.....	Louisiana, Mo.....	Louisiana, Mo.....	.34	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.....	Mt. Pis. Jct., Ia.....	Mt. Pleasant, Ia.....	.68	
Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge company.....	At Keokuk, Iowa.....		.03	
Terminal Railroad Assn. of St. Louis.....	At N. M. St., St. L.....	Union station, St. Louis.....	3.88	
S. & C. M. & St. L. B. railroad.....	West Alton.....	Alton.....	2.64	
At Alton.....			.29	
St. L., C. & St. P. railway.....	At Alton.....		.23	
C. C. O. & St. L. railway.....	At Alton.....	East St. Louis.....	22.85	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.....	At East St. Louis.....		.97	
Total.....				264.54

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	W. W. Baldwin.....	Burlington, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	J. C. Peasley.....	Chicago, Ill.
Second Vice-President.....	Geo. B. Harris.....	Chicago, Ill.
Secretary.....	W. C. Maxwell.....	Keokuk, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	J. C. Peasley.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Solicitors.....	Spencer & Mosman.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Attorney or General Counsel.....	H. H. Trimble.....	Keokuk, Iowa.
General Auditor.....	C. I. Sturgis.....	Chicago, Ill.
Auditor.....	C. M. Carter.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Assistant Auditor.....	Ben L. Crosby.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
General Manager.....	Howard Elliott.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Chief Engineer.....	L. F. Goodale.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
General Superintendent.....	S. E. Crance.....	St. Joseph, Mo.
Superintendent.....	W. E. Cunningham.....	Hannibal, Mo.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	T. J. Lowrie.....	Hannibal, Mo.
General Freight Agent.....	D. O. Ives.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	Wm. Gray.....	St. Louis, Mo.
General Passenger Agent.....	L. W. Wakeley.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant General Passenger Agent.....	C. L. Grice.....	St. Louis, Mo.
General Baggage Agent.....	E. A. Sudd.....	Chicago, Ill.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
C. E. Perkins.....	Burlington, Iowa.	J. Malcolm Forbes.....	Boston, Mass.
F. W. Hunnewell.....	Boston, Mass.	W. W. Baldwin.....	Burlington, Iowa.
C. J. Paine.....	Boston, Mass.		

## CHICAGO, FORT MADISON &amp; DES MOINES RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock: a Main line.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of road named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. a Chi., Ft. Madison & Des Moines R.R. Co.....	Fort Madison.....	Ottumwa.....	71	71

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	Isaac T. Burr.....	Boston, Mass.
President.....	E. S. Conway.....	Chicago, Ill.
First Vice-President.....	E. F. Potter.....	Ft. Madison, Iowa.
Secretary.....	E. H. Skinner.....	Birmingham, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	E. H. Skinner.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Solicitor.....	Jesse A. Baldwin.....	Chicago, Ill.
Attorney or General Counsel.....	Casey & Stewart.....	Ft. Madison, Iowa.
Auditor.....	J. P. Irving.....	Ft. Madison, Iowa.
General Manager.....	E. F. Potter.....	Ft. Madison, Iowa.
Division Superintendent.....	G. D. Hutchison.....	Ft. Madison, Iowa.
General Freight Agent.....	E. F. Potter.....	Ft. Madison, Iowa.
General Passenger Agent.....	E. F. Potter.....	Ft. Madison, Iowa.



## CHICAGO, FT. MADISON &amp; DES MOINES RAILROAD CO.—CONTINUED.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
E. S. Conway .....	Chicago, Ill.	E. H. Spinner .....	Birmingham, Iowa.
J. A. Baldwin .....	Chicago, Ill.	I. T. Eurr. ....	Boston, Mass.
E. F. Potter .....	Ft. Madison, Iowa.	G. T. W. Braman .....	Boston, Mass.
Samuel Atlee .....	Ft. Madison, Iowa.	G. D. Braman .....	Boston, Mass.

## CHICAGO, IOWA &amp; DAKOTA RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

## 1. Railroad line represented by capital stock.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.
	FROM—	TO—	
Chicago, Iowa & Dakota railway. ....	Eldora Junction.	Alden .....	26.4

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President .....	Conrad Miller .....	Bangor, Penn.
First Vice-President .....	Clarence Mitchell. ....	New York City.
Treasurer .....	H. N. Brockway .....	Garner, Iowa.
Attorney or General Counsel .....	J. D. Newcomer .....	Eldora, Iowa.
Auditor .....	O. E. Albrook .....	Eldora, Iowa.
General Manager .....	H. C. Stuart .....	Eldora, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph .....	W. S. Beman .....	Eldora, Iowa.
General Freight Agent .....	H. C. Stuart .....	Eldora, Iowa.
General Passenger Agent .....	H. C. Stuart .....	Eldora, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Conrad Miller .....	Bangor, Penn.	H. C. Stuart .....	Eldora, Iowa.
Clarence Mitchell .....	New York City.	W. S. Porter .....	Eldora, Iowa.
H. N. Brockway .....	Garner, Iowa.	C. L. Blair .....	New York City.
J. D. Newcomer .....	Eldora, Iowa.		

## CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock { <sup>a</sup> Main line.  
<sup>b</sup> Branches and spurs.  
 5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of road named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. <sup>a</sup> Chicago Great Western Railway Co. ....	St. Paul, Minn. ....	Dubuque, Iowa. ....	253.53	
	Aiken, Ill. ....	Forest Home, Ill. ....	146.73	
	Oelwein, Iowa. ....	Des Moines, Iowa. ....	150.83	
	Des Moines, Ia. ....	St. Joseph, Mo. ....	159.25	
	Bee Creek, Mo. ....	Beverly, Mo. ....	23.00	
<sup>b</sup> .....	Hayfield, Minn. ....	Manly Jet, Iowa. ....	47.20	712.84
	Sumner, Iowa. ....	Hampton, Iowa. ....	63.95	
	Cedar Falls, Ia. ....	Wilson Jet, Iowa. ....	7.48	
	Eden, Minn. ....	Mantorville, Mn. ....	7.57	
	Sycamore, Ill. ....	De Kalb, Ill. ....	5.81	
5. St. Paul & Northern Pacific .....	Minneapolis, M. ....	St. Paul, Minn. ....	10.56	122.01
	Dunleath & Dubuque Bridge company. ....	E. Dubuque, Ill. ....	.59	
	Illinois Central .....	E. Dubuque, Ill. ....	13.23	
	Chicago & Burlington & Northern .....	Portage O'rve, Ill. ....	1.85	
	Chicago & Northern Pacific .....	Aiken, Ill. ....	10.18	
	Des Moines Union railway .....	Forest Home, Ill. ....	2.26	
	Des Moines & Kansas City .....	In City of Des Moines, Iowa. ....	.44	
	Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bl'ts. ....	In City of Des Moines, Iowa. ....	.81	
	St. Joseph Terminal Railway company. ....	In City of St. Joseph, Mo. ....	.39	
	Kansas City Northwestern .....	Leavenw'h, Kan. ....	27.91	
	Leavenworth, Northern & Southern .....	Kansas C'y, Kan. ....	2.46	
	Leavenworth, Topeka & Southwestern. ....	In City of Leavenworth, Kan. ....	1.40	
	Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific .....	Beverly, Mo. ....	3.59	
	Leavenworth Terminal Ry. & Bridge Co. ....	Stillings, Mo. ....	1.36	
	Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe .....	St. Joseph, Mo. ....	7.63	
	Kansas City Suburban Belt .....	Bee Creek, Mo. ....	2.50	
		In City of Kansas C'y, Kan. & Mo. ....		
Total .....				87.16
				922.01

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board .....	A. B. Stickney .....	St. Paul, Minn.
President .....	A. B. Stickney .....	St. Paul, Minn.
First Vice-President .....	A. Oppenheim .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Second Vice-President .....	A. Kalman .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Third Vice-President .....	C. W. Benson .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Secretary .....	B. O. Wight .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Treasurer .....	C. O. Kalman .....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Counsel .....	F. B. Kellogg .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Attorney .....	Daniel W. Lawler .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Vice-President and Auditor .....	W. B. Bend .....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Manager .....	Samuel C. Stickney .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Chief Engineer .....	H. Fernstrom .....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Superintendent .....	E. DuPuy .....	St. Paul, Minn.
	J. A. Kelley .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Division Superintendents .....	J. Berlingett .....	Des Moines, Iowa.
	E. W. Edwards .....	Dubuque, Iowa.
Traffic Manager .....	P. C. Stohr .....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Freight Agent .....	S. O. Brooks .....	St. Paul, Minn.
	F. H. Tibbitts .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Assistant General Freight Agents .....	T. N. Hooper .....	St. Paul, Minn.
	E. E. Stohr .....	Chicago, Ill.
	C. E. Berry .....	Kansas City, Mo.
General Passenger Agent .....	F. H. Lord .....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Passenger Agent .....	H. D. Badgley .....	Chicago, Ill.
General Ticket Agent .....	F. H. Lord .....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Ticket Agent .....	H. D. Badgley .....	Chicago, Ill.
General Baggage Agent .....	G. T. Spilman .....	Chicago, Ill.



TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE  
CHICAGO, GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.—CONTINUED.  
DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
H. E. Fletcher.....	Minneapolis, Minn.	Samuel O. Stickney.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Amel Oppenheim.....	St. Paul, Minn.	A. B. Stickney.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Charles S. Wormser.....	New York City.	Arnold Kaiman.....	St. Paul, Minn.
O. W. Benson.....	St. Paul, Minn.	F. Weyershauser.....	St. Paul, Minn.
J. W. Lusk.....	St. Paul, Minn.		

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

PROPERTY OPERATED.

FROM—	TO—	Illinois	Wisconsin.	Iowa.	Minnesota.	North Dakota.	South Dakota.	Missouri	Michigan.	Total.
Chicago.....	Milwaukee.....	45.06	87.92							82.98
Rondout.....	Libertyville.....	2.00								3.00
South Milwaukee.....	La Crosse.....		196.87							196.87
Watertown Junction.....	Madison.....		36.48							36.48
Portage City.....	East Madison.....		38.01							38.01
Viroqua Junction.....	Viroqua.....		82.17							82.17
North La Crosse.....	Onalaska.....		5.76							5.76
North La Crosse.....	Minneapolis.....		1.39				136.72			138.11
St. Croix Junction.....	Stillwater.....						24.78			24.78
Milwaukee.....	North McGregor.....		196.60	12						196.62
Stock Yards, Milwaukee.....	Merrill Park.....		.80							.80
Mazomanie.....	Prairie du Sac.....		10.37							10.37
Lone Rock.....	Richland Center.....		16.22							16.22
Calmar.....	Minneapolis.....				41.38	130.64				172.02
Conover.....	Decorah.....				10.00					10.00
Austin.....	Mason City.....			27.95						27.95
Mendota.....	St. Paul.....			27.95						5.56
Northfield.....	Cannon Junction.....				31.98					31.98
North McGregor.....	Chamberlain.....			291.48			149.77			441.25
Beulah.....	Elkader.....			19.30						19.30
Spencer.....	Spirit Lake.....			20.18						20.18
Rock Valley.....	Hudson.....			8.99				39		9.38
Marion Junction.....	Running Water.....						62.85			62.85
Chestnut street, Milwaukee.....	Portage City.....		100.37							100.37
Cement Line Junction.....	Rock.....		1.03							1.06
Iron Ridge.....	Fond du Lac.....		31.14							31.14
Horicon.....	Berlin.....		42.30							42.30
Brandon.....	Markesan.....		11.49							11.49
Ripon.....	Oshkosh.....		19.69							19.69
Rush Lake Junction.....	Winneconne.....		14.89							14.89
Merrill Park.....	North Milwaukee.....		6.17							6.17
South Minneapolis.....	Aberdeen.....				178.74		107.02			285.76
Glencoe.....	Hutchinson.....				13.49					13.49
Hopkins.....	Lake Minnetonka.....				7.84					7.84
Hastings.....	Benton Junction.....				63.71					63.71
Milbank.....	Sisseton.....						37.24			37.24
Andover.....	Harlem.....					17.20	38.71			55.91
Wabasha.....	Zumbrota.....				60.21					60.21
Racine.....	Kittredge.....	60.63	69.31							129.94
Savanna.....	East Moline.....	47.70								47.70
Janesville.....	Beloit.....		19.88							19.88
Elkhorn.....	Eagle.....		16.59							16.59
Rockton.....	Rockford.....	14.94								14.94



## CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE &amp; ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY—CONTINUED.

## PROPERTY OPERATED—CONTINUED.

228

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE

BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS.

229

FROM—	TO—	Illinois.	Wisconsin.	Iowa.	Minnesota.	North Dakota.	South Dakota.	Missouri.	Michigan.	Total.
Manilla.....	Mitchell.....			95.90			129.89			225.79
Elk Point.....	Sioux Falls Junction.....			34.92			67.81			102.73
Tripp.....	Armour.....						20.45			20.45
North Chicago.....	Savanna.....	138.87								138.87
Galewood.....	Dunning.....	2.98								2.98
Savanna.....	Council Bluffs.....			349.18						349.18
Elk River Junction.....	Olinton.....			10.05						10.05
Davenport.....	Jackson Junction.....			153.37						153.37
Eldridge.....	Hurstville.....			34.61						34.61
Paralta.....	Farley.....			43.68						43.68
La Crescent.....	Woonsocket.....				296.22		97.20			393.42
Wells.....	Mankato.....				38.08					38.08
Madison.....	Bristol.....						108.02			108.02
Milton.....	Shullsburg.....	76.84								76.84
Brodhead.....	New Glarus.....	22.78								22.78
Warren.....	Mineral Point.....	81.28								81.28
Calamine.....	Platteville.....	17.08								17.08
Sabula Junction.....	River Junction.....			138.18	24.63					161.11
Bellevue.....	Cascade.....			35.77						35.77
Turkey River Junction.....	West Union.....			58.34						58.34
Waukon Junction.....	Waukon.....			22.95						22.95
Reno.....	Preston.....				67.77					67.77
Tomah.....	Star Lake.....	183.22								183.22
New Lisbon.....	Vesper.....	50.07								50.07
Dexter ville.....	Romadka.....	27.65								27.65
Wabasha.....	Chippewa Falls.....	61.18			1.83					63.01
Red Cedar Junction.....	Cedar Falls.....	23.67								23.67
Ortonville.....	Fargo.....				46.29		1.28			116.97
Mitchell.....	Edgeley.....				31.61		161.03			192.64
Aberdeen.....	Bowdle.....						57.02			57.02
Orient.....	Eureka.....						97.38			97.38
Marion.....	Coburg.....			159.27				140.87		299.54
Chicago.....	Llewellyn Park.....	13.75								13.75
North Milwaukee.....	Champion.....	198.09							57.70	253.81
Hubert Junction.....	Appleton.....	20.35								20.35
Menasha.....	Neenah.....	1.49								1.49
Oconto Junction.....	Oconto.....	11.94								11.94
Ellis Junction.....	Menominee.....	21.09							1.34	22.43
Wausaukee.....	Girard Junction.....	17.65								17.65
Channing.....	Ontonagon.....								92.87	92.87
Totals.....		817.94	1,650.46	1,558.47	1,120.09	118.21	1,101.06	140.27	152.00	6,153.50

Total miles of road..... 6,153.50  
 Less miles of track owned jointly, 11.19—one-half..... 5.59  
 Add line operated under trackage rights..... 6,147.90  
 Total..... 6,190.67

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Philip D. Armour.....	Chicago, Ill.	Frederick Layton.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
Arthur Belmont.....	New York, N. Y.	Joseph Milbank.....	New York, N. Y.
Charles H. Coster.....	New York, N. Y.	William Rockefeller.....	New York, N. Y.
Charles D. Dickey.....	New York, N. Y.	Samuel Spencer.....	New York, N. Y.
Peter Gadles.....	New York, N. Y.	A. Van Santvoord.....	New York, N. Y.
Charles W. Harkness.....	New York, N. Y.		
President, Board of Railroad Commissioners.....	Chicago, Ill.	Robert Miller.....	Chicago, Ill.
Secretary.....	Chicago, Ill.	A. J. Farling.....	Chicago, Ill.
Treasurer.....	Chicago, Ill.	P. W. Myers.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
General Solicitor.....	Chicago, Ill.	Barton Hanson.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Solicitor.....	Chicago, Ill.	G. H. Field.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Solicitor.....	Chicago, Ill.	G. B. Keeler.....	Chicago, Ill.
Comptroller.....	Chicago, Ill.	E. Q. Sewall.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Auditor.....	Chicago, Ill.	W. F. Judson.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Auditor.....	Chicago, Ill.	W. G. Collins.....	Chicago, Ill.
Chief Engineer.....	Chicago, Ill.	D. J. Whitmore.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Superintendent.....	Chicago, Ill.	H. R. Williams.....	Chicago, Ill.
Division Superintendents.....	Chicago, Ill.	U. J. Fry.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	Chicago, Ill.	A. G. Bird.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Traffic Manager.....	Chicago, Ill.	Four in number.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Agent, Freight Agents.....	Chicago, Ill.	G. H. Hartford.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Passenger and Ticket Agents.....	Chicago, Ill.	Two in number.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Passenger and Ticket Agent.....	Chicago, Ill.	G. S. Marsh.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Baggage Agent.....	Chicago, Ill.	W. D. Carrick.....	Chicago, Ill.
Land Commissioner.....	Chicago, Ill.	H. G. Hansen.....	Milwaukee, Wis.

## DIRECTORS.



CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.  
PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.
	FROM—	TO—		
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.	Chicago, Ill.	Council Bluffs, Ia.	500.20	
	Davenport, Iowa	Atchison, Kan.	341.24	
	Edgerton Jc., Mo	Leavenworth, Kan.	30.16	
	Washington, Ia.	Knoxville, Iowa	79.00	
	S. Englewood, Ill.	S. Chicago, Ill.	7.43	
	Wilton, Iowa....	Mascot, Iowa	12.04	
	Wilton, Iowa....	Lime Kilns, Iowa	6.08	
	Newton, Iowa....	Monroe, Iowa....	17.02	
	Des Moines, Ia....	Indianola and Winterset, Ia.	47.08	
	Menlo, Iowa....	Guthrie Cntr. Ia.	14.44	
	Atlantic, Iowa....	Audubon, Iowa....	24.41	
	Atlantic, Iowa....	Griswold, Iowa....	14.22	
	Avoca, Iowa....	Carson, Iowa....	17.73	
	Avoca, Iowa....	Harlan, Iowa....	11.88	
	Mt. Zion, Iowa....	Keosauqua, Ia....	4.50	
	Altamont, Mo....	St. Joseph, Mo....	49.85	
	S. St. Joseph, Mo.	Rushville, Mo....	15.31	
	Kansas City, Mo.	Armo'dale, Kan.	2.40	
	S. Omaha, Neb....	Jansen, Neb....	104.30	
	Elwood, Kan....	Liberal, Kan....	439.54	
	Herrington, Kan.	Terral, I. T....	349.07	
	Herrington, Kan.	Salina, Kan....	49.20	
	Horton, Kan....	Roswell, Col....	568.05	
	Fairbury, Neb....	Nelson, Neb....	51.53	
	McFarland, Kan.	Belleville, Kan.	103.98	
	Dodge City, Kan.	Bucklin, Kan....	26.64	
	Chickasha, I. T.	O. T....	51.22	2,988.62
Peoria & Bureau Valley railroad.....	Bureau, Ill.	Peoria, Ill.	45.99	
Keokuk & Des Moines railway.....	Keokuk, Iowa....	Des Moines, Iowa	162.29	
Des Moines & Ft. Dodge railroad.....	Des Moines, Ia....	Ft. Dodge and Ruthven, Iowa	143.51	362.70
Hannibal & St. Joseph railroad.....	Cameron, Mo....	Kansas City, Mo.	54.30	
Union Pacific railroad.....	Council Bluffs, Ia.	S. Omaha, Neb.	7.02	
	Kansas City, Mo.	N. Topeka, Kan.	67.35	
	Limon, Col....	Denver, Col....	89.78	
Denver & Rio Grande railroad.....	Denver, Col....	Pueblo, Col....	119.60	338.05
Total.....				2,619.37

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	R. R. Cable.....	Rock Island, Ill.
President.....	W. G. Purdy.....	Chicago, Ill.
First Vice-President.....	H. A. Parker.....	Chicago, Ill.
Second Vice-President.....	Robert Mather.....	Chicago, Ill.
Third Vice-President.....	J. M. Johnson.....	Chicago, Ill.
Secretary.....	George H. Crosby.....	Chicago, Ill.
Treasurer.....	F. E. Hayne.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Attorney.....	Robert Mather.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Attorney.....	M. A. Law.....	Topeka, Kan.
Auditor.....	S. C. Matthews.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant Auditor.....	H. F. Morris.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Manager.....	H. A. Parker.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Manager.....	W. J. Allen.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Superintendent.....	A. J. Elus.....	Chicago, Ill.
Division Superintendent.....	W. H. Stillwell.....	Topeka, Kan.
Division Superintendent.....	C. H. Hubbell.....	Chicago, Ill.
Division Superintendent.....	C. L. Nichols.....	Blue Island, Ill.
Division Superintendent.....	W. M. Hobbs.....	Des Moines, Iowa.

## OFFICERS—CONTINUED.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Division Superintendent.....	C. N. Gilmore.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
Division Superintendent.....	W. J. Lawrence.....	Trenton, Mo.
Division Superintendent.....	C. W. Jones.....	Horton, Kan.
Division Superintendent.....	F. C. Smith.....	Colorado Sp'gs, Col.
Division Superintendent.....	A. T. Abbott.....	Herrington, Kan.
Division Superintendent.....	S. B. Hovey.....	Ft. Worth, Texas.
Freight Traffic Manager.....	J. M. Johnson.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant Freight Traffic Manager.....	H. Gower.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Freight Agent.....	E. B. Boyd.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Freight Agent.....	H. H. Embry.....	Topeka, Kan.
General Passenger and Ticket Agent.....	John Sebastian.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Passenger and Ticket Agent.....	E. E. MacLeod.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Passenger and Ticket Agent.....	L. M. Allen.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Passenger and Ticket Agent.....	E. W. Thompson.....	Topeka, Kan.
General Baggage Agent.....	George W. Duback.....	Chicago, Ill.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	A. B. Swift.....	Chicago, Ill.
Land Commissioner.....	J. L. Drew.....	Davenport, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
H. R. Bishop.....	New York City.	A. R. Flower.....	New York City.
Henry M. Flagler.....	New York City.	Marshall Field.....	Chicago, Ill.
Alexander E. Orr.....	New York City.	W. G. Purdy.....	Chicago, Ill.
Ogden Mills.....	New York City.	H. A. Parker.....	Chicago, Ill.
G. S. Browster.....	New York City.	R. R. Cable.....	Rock Island, Ill.
W. A. Nash.....	New York City.	F. H. Griggs.....	Davenport, Iowa.
Tracy Dows.....	New York City.		



## CHICAGO &amp; NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

MILES OF COMPLETED ROAD, JUNE 30, 1899.

	Total.	Illinois.	Iowa.	Wisconsin.	Michigan.	Minnesota.	South Dakota.	North Dakota.	Nebraska.
LINES CHARTERED AS OR CONSOLIDATED WITH CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.									
Chicago to Council Bluffs	491.00	137.88	353.12						
Chicago to Freeport	121.00	121.00							
Geneva to Aurora	9.40	9.40							
Geneva to St. Charles	2.40	2.40							
Sycamore to Cortland	4.64	4.64							
Elgin to Williams Bay	51.04	35.82		15.22					
Belvidere to Spring Valley	75.78	75.78							
South Branch Jc. to River (Chicago)	4.50	4.50							
Clinton to Anamosa (Quarry)	73.57		73.57						
Stanwood to Tipton	8.50		8.50						
Out off near Cedar Rapids	5.96		5.96						
Des Moines to Jewell Junction	59.09		59.09						
Tama to Elmore	164.56		164.56						
Jewell Junction to Wall Lake Junc.	73.68		73.68						
Eagle Grove to Hawarden	145.20		145.20						
Belle Plaine to Muchakinock	64.00		64.00						
Boone to coal banks	3.25		3.25						
Maple River Junction to Onawa	80.85		80.85						
Wall Lake to Merville	79.87		79.87						
Carroll to Kirkman	34.81		34.81						
Manning to Audubon	17.00		17.00						
Chicago to Ft. Howard	242.20	69.73		172.47					
Appleton water power ext.	3.63			3.63					
Kenosha to Rockford	72.10	44.03		28.07					
Chicago to Montrose	5.20	5.20							
Montrose to North Evanston	7.69	7.69							
Chicago to Milwaukee	85.00	44.60		40.40					
Milwaukee to Fond du Lac	62.63			62.63					
Sheboygan to Princeton	78.40			78.40					
Milwaukee to Montfort	140.88			140.88					
Montfort to Galena	46.34	10.30		36.04					
Montfort to Woodman	30.50			30.50					
Ipswich to Platteville	4.00			4.00					
Lancaster Junction to Lancaster	12.04			12.04					
Janesville to Afton	6.10			6.10					
Belvidere to Winona	227.00	21.00		205.87		.13			
Winona Junction to La Crosse	3.96			3.96					
Trempealeau to Galesville	6.71			6.71					
Evansville to Janesville	15.68			15.68					
Ft. Howard to Republic	202.64			49.45	153.19				
Olowrie to Michigamme	10.44			10.44					
Wabie to Champion	1.23			1.23					
Powers to Watersmeet	104.33			13.73	90.60				
Stager to Crystal Falls	9.10				9.10				
Naventa to Metropolitan	34.86				34.86				
BRANCHES TO MINES—									
Off main line	42.27			42.27					
Off E. & L. S. line	8.44			8.44					
Off Menominee River line	36.13			4.71	31.42				
Crystal Falls to Hemlock mine	15.00				15.00				
Off Ashland division	34.22			4.89	29.33				
Industries off Ashland division	21.44			20.92	.52				
Lake Shore Jct. to Ashland, Wis.	386.13			319.24	66.89				
Monico Junction to Hurley, Wis.	88.11			88.11					
Two Rivers Jct. to Two Rivers, Wis.	6.35			6.35					
Hortonville to Oshkosh, Wis.	23.10			23.10					
Eland Junction to Marshfield, Wis.	63.87			63.87					
North of Antigto to E. Bryant switch	7.27			7.27					
Pratt Junction to Harrison	17.85			17.85					
Parrish Junction to Parrish	4.54			4.54					
Watersmeet to Choate	22.82				22.82				
Interior Junction to Interior	1.61				1.61				
Oragsmere to Robbins	3.47				3.47				
Hurley to end of track	12.97			12.97					
Potato River Jct. to end of track	2.60			2.60					
Extension through section 34	1.34			1.34					
Northern Junction to Wabeno	46.11			46.11					
Tot. C. & N.-W. Ry. (char. or con.)	3,828.40	593.97	1,163.12	1,549.65	521.19	.47			

## PROPERTY OPERATED—CONTINUED.

	Total.	Illinois.	Iowa.	Wisconsin.	Michigan.	Minnesota.	South Dakota.	North Dakota.	Nebraska.
PROPRIETARY LINES, VIZ.:									
Princeton & Western railway	16.06			16.06					
Valley Junction to Necedah									
Winona & St. Peter railroad	448.48					288.50	34.48		
Winona to Watertown						3.75			
Mankato Junction to Mankato						24.40			
Sleepy Eye to Redwood Falls						24.48			
Rochester to Zumbrota						15.01			
Eyota to Plainview						11.46			
Eyota to Chatfield						46.49			
Tracy to Dakota line									
Dakota Central railway	723.03								
Minnesota state line to Pierre						209.11			
James Valley Junction to Oakes						117.67	14.28		
Watertown Jct. to Watertown						43.83			
Watertown to Gettysburg						146.25			
Iroquois to Hawarden (state line)						125.49			
Centerville to Yankton						28.46			
Doland to Groton						38.84			
Total	1,188.47			16.06		414.00	744.13	14.28	
LEASED LINES, VIZ.:									
St. Paul Eastern Grand Trunk Ry.	60.02								
Clintonville to Oconto				56.00					
Spurs				4.02					
Total	60.02			60.02					

## RECAPITULATION.

C. & N.-W. Ry. (char. or con.)	3,828.40	593.97	1,163.12	1,549.65	521.19	.47			
Proprietary lines	1,188.47			16.06			414.00	744.13	14.28
Leased lines	60.02			60.02					
Total	5,076.89	593.97	1,163.12	1,625.73	521.19	.47	414.47	744.13	14.28
ADD OPER. UNDER TRACKAGE RIGHTS:									
Council Bluffs (Broadway to S. Omaha)	8.73		3.07						5.66
Grand total	5,085.62	593.97	1,166.19	1,625.73	521.19	.47	414.47	744.13	14.28 5.66

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board	Albert Keep	Chicago.
President	Marvin Hughitt	Chicago.
First Vice-President	Martin L. Sykes	New York.
Second Vice-President	Marshall M. Kirkman	Chicago.
Third Vice-President	Hiram R. McCullough	Chicago.
Secretary	Martin L. Sykes	New York.
Treasurer	S. O. Howe	New York.
General Counsel	Lloyd W. Bowers	Chicago.
Auditor	J. B. Redfield	Chicago.
General Manager	John M. Whitman	Chicago.
Chief Engineer	John E. Blunt	Chicago.
General Superintendent	Sherburne Sanborn	Chicago.
Assistant General Superintendent	William A. Gardner	Chicago.
Division Superintendent	Richard H. Ashton	Boone, Iowa.
Division Superintendent—Iowa Lines	Wm. D. Hodge	Eagle Grove, Iowa.
Division Superintendent	S. M. Braden	Lake City, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph	George H. Thayer	Chicago.
Traffic Manager	Hiram R. McCullough	Chicago.
General Freight Agent	Marvin Hughitt, Jr.	Chicago.
General Passenger Agent	Warren B. Kniskern	Chicago.
General Ticket Agent	Warren B. Kniskern	Chicago.
General Baggage Agent	Nathaniel A. Phillips	Chicago.
Land Commissioner	J. F. Cleveland	Chicago.



## CHICAGO &amp; NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—CONTINUED.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
David P. Kimball.....	Boston.	Marvin Hughitt.....	Chicago.
Chauncey M. Depew.....	New York.	N. K. Fairbank.....	Chicago.
Sam'l F. Barger.....	New York.	Byron L. Smith.....	Chicago.
Albert Keep.....	Lake Geneva, Wis.	Cyrus H. McCormick.....	Chicago.
M. L. Sykes.....	New York.	F. W. Vanderbilt.....	New York.
James C. Fargo.....	New York.	W. K. Vanderbilt.....	New York.
Oliver Ames.....	Boston.	H. McK. Twombly.....	New York.
Zenas Crane.....	Dalton, Mass.	John I. Blair.....	Blairstown, N. J.
James Stillman.....	New York.		

## CHICAGO, ST. PAUL, MINNEAPOLIS &amp; OMAHA RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock—Main line.
5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of r'ds named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & O. Ry.	Elroy.....	St. Paul.....	195.17	
	N. Wisconsin Jct.	Bayfield.....	178.24	
	Eau Claire.....	Spooner.....	81.51	
	Superior Jct.....	Duluth.....	71.45	
	St. Paul.....	Le Mars.....	243.76	
	Missouri Riv. at Covington.....	Omaha.....	123.06	
	St. Croix Draw Bridge.....	Stillwater Switch	4.55	
	Stillwater Jct.....	Stillwater.....	3.30	
	River Falls Jct.....	Ellsworth.....	24.82	
	Merrillan.....	Marshfield.....	38.67	
	Ashland Jct.....	Ashland.....	4.38	
	Ashland Shore Line.....	Line.....	1.31	
	West Eau Claire.	Shaw's Mill.....	2.74	
	Fairchild.....	Mondovi.....	37.00	
	Menomonie Jct.....	Menomonie City.	3.01	
	Menomonie Jct.....	Cedar Falls.....	2.01	
	Lake Crystal.....	Elmore.....	43.48	
	Heron Lake.....	Pipestone.....	55.10	
	Sioux Falls Jct.....	Mitchell.....	130.73	
	Luverne.....	Doon.....	28.00	
	Coburn Jct.....	Newcastle.....	28.85	
	Emerson.....	Norfolk.....	46.60	
	Wakefield.....	Hartington.....	33.76	
	Wayne.....	Bloomfield.....	43.14	
				1,422.64
5. St. Louis River Bridge (N. P. Ry.).....	West Superior...	Rice's Point.....	1.59	
Great Northern railway.....	St. Paul.....	Minneapolis.....	11.40	
The Minneapolis & St. Louis railroad..	Minneapolis.....	Merrillan Jct.....	27.00	
Illinois Central railroad.....	Le Mars.....	Sioux City.....	25.20	
Sioux City Bridge company.....	Bridge across M	issouri river and	3.90	
	tracks at Sioux	City.....		
Sioux City & Pacific railroad.....	Sioux City.....	Sioux Citybridge track.....	.50	
				69.59
Total.....				1,492.23

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	Marvin Hughitt.....	Chicago, Ill.
First Vice-President and Ass't Secretary.....	Martin L. Sykes.....	New York, N. Y.
Second Vice-President and Gen'l Traffic M'gr.....	Jas. T. Olark.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Secretary.....	E. E. Woodman.....	Hudson, Wis.
Treasurer and Second Assistant Secretary.....	S. O. Howe.....	New York, N. Y.
Assistant Treasurer and Third Ass't Secretary.....	R. H. Williams.....	New York, N. Y.
General Counsel.....	Thomas Wilson.....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Attorney.....	L. K. Luse.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Comptroller.....	L. A. Robinson.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Auditor of Expenditures.....	W. H. Stennett.....	Chicago, Ill.
Local Treasurer.....	Chas. P. Nash.....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Manager.....	W. A. Scott.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Chief Engineer.....	C. W. Johnson.....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Superintendent.....	J. O. Stuart.....	St. Paul, Minn.
	L. F. Slaker.....	St. Paul, Minn.
	A. W. Trenholm.....	Itasca, Wis.
Division Superintendents.....	H. Spencer.....	St. James, Minn.
	H. S. Jaynes.....	Omaha, Neb.
	W. H. S. Wright.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Purchasing Agent.....	H. O. Hope.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	H. M. Pearce.....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Freight Agent.....	E. B. Ober.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	T. W. Teasdale.....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Passenger Agent.....	E. F. Wood.....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Baggage Agent.....	A. Drezmal.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Car Accountant.....	E. L. Poole.....	St. Paul, Minn.
General Claim Agent.....	G. W. Bell.....	Hudson, Wis.
Land Commissioner.....		

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Martin L. Sykes.....	New York, N. Y.	H. McK. Twombly.....	New York, N. Y.
Thomas Wilson.....	St. Paul, Minn.	Marvin Hughitt.....	Chicago, Ill.
John M. Whitman.....	Chicago, Ill.	Byron L. Smith.....	Chicago, Ill.
John A. Humbird.....	St. Paul, Minn.	Chauncey M. Depew.....	New York, N. Y.
Cornelius Vanderbilt.....	New York, N. Y.	David P. Kimball.....	Boston, Mass.
Wm. K. Vanderbilt.....	New York, N. Y.	Horace G. Burt.....	Omaha, Neb.
Albert Keep.....	Chicago, Ill.		

## SIOUX CITY &amp; PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of r'ds named.
	FROM—	TO—		
Sioux City & Pacific Railroad company ....	Sioux City, Iowa.	Fremont, Neb.....	101.58	
	Missouri Valley.	California J'ct'n	5.84	
Total main line represented by capital stock .....				107.42



## SIOUX CITY &amp; PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY—CONTINUED.

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	Marvin Hughitt.....	Chicago, Ill.
First Vice-President.....	M. M. Kirkman.....	Chicago, Ill.
Second Vice-President.....	H. R. McCullough.....	Chicago, Ill.
Secretary.....	Joseph B. Redfield.....	Chicago, Ill.
Treasurer.....	M. M. Kirkman.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Counsel.....	Lloyd W. Bowers.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Attorney.....	H. T. White.....	Omaha, Neb.
Comptroller.....	M. M. Kirkman.....	Chicago, Ill.
Auditor.....	Joseph B. Redfield.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Manager.....	George F. Bidwell.....	Omaha, Neb.
Chief Engineer.....	F. M. Marsh.....	Omaha, Neb.
General Superintendent.....	Charles C. Hughes.....	Omaha, Neb.
Division Superintendent.....	Henry O. Mahanna.....	Fremont, Neb.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	William P. McFarlane.....	Omaha, Neb.
General Freight Agent.....	Kingsley C. Morehouse.....	Omaha, Neb.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	Amos H. Merchant.....	Omaha, Neb.
General Passenger Agent.....	John R. Buchanan.....	Omaha, Neb.
Land Commissioner.....	Josiah F. Cleveland.....	Chicago, Ill.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Marvin Hughitt.....	Chicago, Ill.	H. R. McCullough.....	Chicago, Ill.
Albert Keep.....	Lake Geneva, Wis.	W. H. Stennett.....	Chicago, Ill.
M. L. Sykes.....	New York, N. Y.	J. M. Whitman.....	Chicago, Ill.
David P. Kimball.....	Boston, Mass.	J. B. Redfield.....	Chicago, Ill.
M. M. Kirkman.....	Chicago, Ill.		

## CROOKED CREEK RAILROAD &amp; COAL COMPANY.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.
	FROM—	TO—	
Crooked Creek Railroad & Coal company.	Lehigh.....	Webster City ..	17.61

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	W. C. Willson.....	Webster City, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	John Q. Burnham.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
Secretary.....	J. M. Funk.....	Webster City, Iowa.
Auditor.....	C. M. Kellogg.....	Lehigh, Iowa.
General Manager.....	W. C. Willson.....	Webster City, Iowa.
General Freight Agent.....	F. E. Willson.....	Webster City, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
W. C. Willson.....	Webster City, Iowa.	C. T. Burnham.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
F. E. Willson.....	Webster City, Iowa.	A. K. Hamilton.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
J. M. Funk.....	Webster City, Iowa.	Henry W. Leman.....	Chicago, Ill.
John Q. Burnham.....	Milwaukee, Wis.		

## DES MOINES, NORTHERN &amp; WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock.
5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of roads named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. Des Moines, Northern & Western R. R.	Des Moines, Iowa	Fonda, Iowa.....	111.97	
	Clive, Iowa.....	Boone, Iowa.....	34.80	
5. Des Moines Union railway.....	Terminals at Des	Moines.....		146.77
Total .....				2.12
				148.89

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	A. J. Earling.....	Chicago, Ill.
Vice-President.....	Burton Hanson.....	Chicago, Ill.
Secretary.....	P. M. Myers.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
Treasurer.....	F. G. Ranney.....	Chicago, Ill.
Auditor.....	W. N. D. Winne.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Manager.....	W. G. Collins.....	Chicago, Ill.
Chief Engineer.....	D. J. Whittemore.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Superintendent.....	H. R. Williams.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Superintendent.....	C. A. Goodnow.....	Chicago, Ill.
Superintendent.....	F. Horton.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	M. J. Fry.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
Traffic Manager.....	A. O. Bird.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Freight Agent.....	J. H. Hiland.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	E. M. Calkins.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
General Passenger Agent.....	G. H. Heafford.....	Chicago, Ill.
Assistant General Passenger Agent.....	R. M. Calkins.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
General Ticket Agent.....	G. H. Heafford.....	Chicago, Ill.
General Baggage Agent.....	W. D. Carrick.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
Land Commissioner.....	H. G. Haugan.....	Milwaukee, Wis.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
W. G. Collins.....	Chicago, Ill.	O. B. Keeler.....	Chicago, Ill.
A. J. Earling.....	Chicago, Ill.	Roswell Miller.....	Chicago, Ill.
C. A. Goodnow.....	Chicago, Ill.	P. M. Myers.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
Burton Hanson.....	Chicago, Ill.		







# DES MOINES UNION RAILWAY COMPANY—CONTINUED. OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	F. C. Hubbell.....	Des Moines.
President.....	F. C. Hubbell.....	Des Moines.
Vice-President.....	H. D. Thompson.....	Des Moines.
Secretary.....	F. M. Hubbell.....	Des Moines.
Treasurer.....	H. D. Thompson.....	Des Moines.
Attorney, or General Counsel.....	A. B. Cummins.....	Des Moines.
Auditor.....	E. G. Mitchell.....	Des Moines.
General Superintendent.....	J. A. Wagner.....	Des Moines.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
F. M. Hubbell.....	Des Moines.	Cyrus Kirk.....	Des Moines.
F. C. Hubbell.....	Des Moines.	J. Ramsey, Jr.....	Des Moines.
H. D. Thompson.....	Des Moines.	H. L. Magee.....	Des Moines.
O. Huttenlocher.....	Des Moines.		

# IOWA CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock: a Main line.  
b Branches and spurs.  
3. Line operated under lease for specified sum.  
5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of road named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. a Iowa Central Railway company.....	Albia, Iowa.....	Northwood, Ia.....	189.481	
	Oskaloosa, Iowa.....	Mississippi river.....	95.187	
	Mississippi river.....	Iowa Jct., Ill.....	88.859	
				373.267
b.....	Hampton, Iowa.....	Belmond, Iowa.....	22.803	
	Minerva Jct.....	Story City, Iowa.....	34.510	
	Newburg, Iowa.....	State Center, Ia.....	26.640	
	G. & M. Jct., Ia.....	Montezuma, Ia.....	13.612	
	New Sharon, Ia.....	Newton, Iowa.....	27.748	
	Lynnville, Ia.....	Lynnville, Iowa.....	2.500	
	Carbon Jct., Ia.....	Carbonado, Ia.....	2.431	
				129.644
3. Keithsburg Bridge company.....	Across Miss. riv'r.....	Keithsburg, Ill.....	2.570	2.570
5. Peoria & Pekin Union railway.....	Iowa Jct., Ill.....	Peoria, Ill.....	3.500	3.500
Total.....				508.981

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	Robt. J. Kimball.....	New York, N. Y.
Vice-President.....	George R. Morse.....	New York, N. Y.
Secretary.....	S. Seaman Jones.....	New York, N. Y.
Treasurer.....	George R. Morse.....	Oskaloosa, Iowa.
General Auditor.....	G. W. Seavers.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
General Manager.....	T. I. Wasson.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
General Superintendent.....	L. M. Martin.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	O. W. Huntington.....	Oskaloosa, Iowa.
General Freight Agent.....	B. G. Falls.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	J. N. Tittlemore.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
Acting General Passenger Agent.....	S. G. Lutz.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
	W. G. Martin.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Russell Sage.....	New York, N. Y.	Henry A. Gardner.....	Chicago, Ill.
Edward E. Chase.....	New York, N. Y.	Albert G. Frost.....	Chicago, Ill.
George R. Morse.....	New York, N. Y.	Geo. P. Lee.....	Chicago, Ill.
Giles E. Taintor.....	New York, N. Y.	Frederick S. Faies.....	Chicago, Ill.
William E. Strong.....	New York, N. Y.	Charles F. Quincey.....	Chicago, Ill.
E. H. Perkins, Jr.....	New York, N. Y.	Frederick Merritt.....	Chicago, Ill.
Robt. J. Kimball.....	New York, N. Y.	Ben Warren, Jr.....	Peoria, Ill.
Chas. G. Dubois.....	Chicago, Ill.		

# ALBIA & CENTERVILLE RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock: a Main line.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of road named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. a Main line.....	Albia.....	Centerville.....	24.44	24.44

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	F. M. Drake.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
President.....	F. M. Drake.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
Vice-President.....	Russell Sage.....	New York, N. Y.
Assistant Secretary.....	J. J. Slocum.....	New York, N. Y.
Treasurer.....	Russell Sage.....	New York, N. Y.
Assistant Treasurer.....	T. I. Wasson.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
Auditor.....	T. I. Wasson.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
General Manager.....	L. M. Martin.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
General Superintendent.....	O. W. Huntington.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	B. G. Falls.....	Oskaloosa, Iowa.
General Freight Agent.....	J. N. Tittlemore.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	S. G. Lutz.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.
Acting General Passenger Agent.....	W. G. Martin.....	Marshalltown, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Russell Sage.....	New York.	J. J. Slocum.....	New York.
O. W. Osborne.....	New York.	F. M. Drake.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
E. C. Osborne.....	New York.		

# IOWA NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.
	FROM—	TO—	
Iowa Northern Railway company.....	Coifax.....	Valeria.....	5.93
Iowa Northern Railway company.....	Spur.....	Mine.....	1.00



## IOWA NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY—CONTINUED.

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board..	D. Ryan	Des Moines, Iowa.
President.....	J. S. Wylie	Davenport, Iowa.
Vice-President.....	D. Ryan	Des Moines, Iowa.
Secretary.....	Jno. M. Topper, acting.	Colfax, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	Jno. M. Topper, acting.	Colfax, Iowa.
General Solicitor.....	W. O. McElroy	Newton, Iowa.
General Superintendent.	Jno. M. Topper, acting.	Colfax, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
F. H. Griggs.....	Davenport, Iowa.	Rob't Ryan.....	Lincoln, Neb.
D. Ryan.....	Des Moines, Iowa.	Geo. A. Goodrich.....	Colfax, Iowa.
J. S. Wylie.....	Davenport, Iowa.		

## KEOKUK &amp; WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each class of road named.
	FROM—	TO—	
Keokuk & Western Railroad company.....	Alexandria, Mo.	Van Wert, Iowa	142.85
Keokuk & Western Railroad company.....	Des Moines, Ia.	Cainsville, Mo.	112.00
St. Louis, Keokuk & Northwestern railroad....	Keokuk, Iowa...	Alexandria, Mo	5.00
Total.....			259.85

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	J. W. Blythe	Burlington, Iowa.
Vice-President.....	A. C. Goodrich	Keokuk, Iowa.
Secretary.....	H. E. Jarvis	Burlington, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	J. C. Peasley	Chicago, Ill.
Attorney, or General Counsel.....	F. T. Hughes	Keokuk, Iowa.
Auditor.....	T. R. Board	Keokuk, Iowa.
General Manager.....	A. C. Goodrich	Keokuk, Iowa.
Chief Engineer.....	A. C. Goodrich	Keokuk, Iowa.
Superintendent.....	J. P. Boyle	Keokuk, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	J. P. Boyle	Keokuk, Iowa.
Traffic Manager.....	A. C. Goodrich	Keokuk, Iowa.
General Freight Agent.....	A. McCrae	Keokuk, Iowa.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	W. G. Goodrich	Keokuk, Iowa.
General Passenger Agent.....	A. McCrae	Keokuk, Iowa.
Assistant General Passenger Agent.....	W. G. Goodrich	Keokuk, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
J. W. Blythe.....	Burlington, Iowa.	T. DeWitt Cuyler.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
A. C. Goodrich.....	Keokuk, Iowa.	Benjamin Strong.....	New York, N. Y.
E. M. Shelton.....	Burlington, Iowa.	Benjamin Graham.....	New York, N. Y.
W. W. Baldwin.....	Burlington, Iowa.	F. J. Paton.....	New York, N. Y.
F. T. Hughes.....	Keokuk, Iowa.		

## MASON CITY &amp; FORT DODGE RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.
	FROM—	TO—	
Mason City & Fort Dodge Railroad company.....	Mason City, Ia.	Lehigh, Iowa....	88.1
Mason City & Fort Dodge Railroad company.....	Carbon Jct., Ia.	Coalville, Iowa.	3.9
Total.....			92

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	W. C. Toomey.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Vice-President.....	Hamilton Browne.....	Boone, Iowa.
Secretary.....	S. T. Meservey.....	Fort Dodge, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	S. T. Meservey.....	Fort Dodge, Iowa.
Assistant Treasurer.....	O. B. Grant.....	Fort Dodge, Iowa.
Auditor.....	J. Warwick.....	Fort Dodge, Iowa.
Superintendent.....	O. B. Grant.....	Fort Dodge, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	W. M. Salsbury.....	Fort Dodge, Iowa.
General Freight Agent.....	S. D. Parkhurst.....	Fort Dodge, Iowa.
General Passenger Agent.....	S. D. Parkhurst.....	Fort Dodge, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Jas. J. Hill.....	St. Paul, Minn.	W. C. Toomey.....	St. Paul, Minn.
D. C. Shepard.....	St. Paul, Minn.	Hamilton Browne.....	Boone, Iowa.
Louis W. Hill.....	St. Paul, Minn.		

## MINNEAPOLIS &amp; ST. LOUIS RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock { a Main line.
- b Branches and spurs.
5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of road named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. a Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co.	Min'apolis, Minn	Angus, Iowa....		259.90
b Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co.	Kalo Jct., Iowa.	Kato, Iowa.....	1.46	
	Hopkins, Minn...	Watertown, S. D.	215.42	
	Manitou Jct.....	Tonka Bay, Minn	1.45	
	Winthrop, Minn.	New Ulm, Minn.	20.23	
5. Northern Pacific Railroad company....	St. Paul, Minn...	Min'apolis, Minn.		238.55
Total.....				10.11
				508.56



MINNEAPOLIS & ST. LOUIS RAILROAD COMPANY—CONTINUED.  
OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	Edwin Hawley.....	New York City.
Secretary and Assistant Treasurer.....	Joseph Gaskell.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
Treasurer.....	Frank H. Davis.....	New York City.
General Counsel.....	William Strauss.....	New York City.
General Attorney.....	Albert E. Clarke.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
Auditor.....	Frank Nay.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
General Manager.....	L. F. Day.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
Chief Engineer.....	H. G. Kelley.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
General Superintendent.....	T. E. Clarke.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
General Freight Agent.....	W. M. Hopkins.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	R. G. Brown.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
General Passenger Agent.....	A. B. Cutts.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
General Ticket Agent.....	A. B. Cutts.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
General Baggage Agent.....	A. B. Cutts.....	Minneapolis, Minn.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Edwin Hawley.....	New York, N. Y.	F. E. Palmer.....	New York, N. Y.
John E. Searles.....	New York, N. Y.	L. C. Weir.....	New York, N. Y.
F. H. Davis.....	New York, N. Y.	George Crocker.....	San Francisco, Cal.
William Strauss.....	New York, N. Y.	L. F. Day.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
Edwin Langdon.....	New York, N. Y.		

## MUSCATINE NORTH &amp; SOUTH RAILROAD.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock { a Main line.  
b Branches and spurs.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.
	FROM—	TO—	
1. a Muscatine North & South R. R. Co.....	Muscatine, Iowa	Elrick Jct., Iowa	28.67
b.....	Main line Jct.....	Stewart Road, (3,696.2 feet).....	.69
Total.....			29.36

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	W. R. Stewart, Jr. ....	Muscatine, Iowa.
Vice-President.....	Henry Levis.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Secretary.....	Henry Jayne.....	Muscatine, Iowa.
Auditor.....	R. M. Darley.....	Muscatine, Iowa.
General Manager.....	W. R. Stewart, Jr.....	Muscatine, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	R. M. Darley.....	Muscatine, Iowa.
General Freight Agent.....	R. M. Darley.....	Muscatine, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
W. R. Stewart, Jr.....	New York, N. Y.	L. M. Martin.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
H. T. Baich.....	Minneapolis, Minn.	F. M. Martin.....	Muscatine, Iowa.
M. J. Peppard.....	Minneapolis, Minn.	Henry Jayne.....	Muscatine, Iowa.
Henry Levis.....	Philadelphia, Pa.		

OMAHA & ST. LOUIS RAILROAD COMPANY.  
PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock: a Main line.  
5. Line operated under trackage rights.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of r's named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. a The Omaha & St. Louis Railroad Co..	Patt'nsburg, Mo.	Council Bl'ts, Ia	143.39	143.39
5. Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul R'y Co..	In Council Bl'ts, terminal track		.34	.34
Total.....				143.73

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	Theo. Gilman.....	New York.
President.....	A. E. Stillwell.....	Kansas City, Mo.
First Vice-President.....	J. McD. Trimble.....	Kansas City, Mo.
Secretary.....	A. O. Robinson.....	Kansas City, Mo.
Treasurer.....	C. A. Broley.....	Kansas City, Mo.
Assistant Treasurer.....	W. D. Tucker.....	Kansas City, Mo.
General Solicitor.....	J. McD. Trimble.....	Kansas City, Mo.
Attorney.....	J. G. Trimble.....	Kansas City, Mo.
Auditor.....	H. H. Kendrick.....	Quincy, Ill.
General Manager.....	W. G. Brinson.....	Quincy, Ill.
Chief Engineer.....	E. M. Colliers.....	Quincy, Ill.
General Superintendent.....	J. F. Sheridan.....	Stanbury, Mo.
Division Superintendent.....		Patonsburg, Mo.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	C. U. Atkinson.....	Kansas City, Mo.
General Freight Agent.....	Charles E. Gibbs.....	Omaha, Neb.
Assistant General Freight Agent.....	G. M. Entriken.....	Omaha, Neb.
General Passenger Agent.....	Charles E. Gibbs.....	Omaha, Neb.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
E. T. Stotesburg.....	Philadelphia.	J. McD. Trimble.....	Kansas City, Mo.
George C. Thomas.....	Philadelphia.	W. Emlen Roosevelt....	New York.
Theodore Gilman.....	New York	Francis Smith.....	New York.
A. E. Stillwell.....	Kansas City, Mo.		

## SIOUX CITY &amp; NORTHERN RAILROAD COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

1. Railroad line represented by capital stock.  
2. Proprietary companies whose entire capital stock is owned by this company.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of r's named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. Sioux City & Northern Railroad Co.....	Sioux City, Ia....	Garretson, S. D..	.96	.96
2. Sioux City Terminal Railroad & Warehouse company.....	Division street, Sioux City, Ia.	Douglas street, Sioux City, Ia.	1.28	1.28
Total.....			97.28	97.28



## SIOUX CITY &amp; NORTHERN RAILROAD COMPANY—CONTINUED.

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	Samuel J. Beals.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	Ora L. Wright.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
Secretary.....	H. S. Baker.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	H. S. Baker.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
Att'y, or General Counsel for railroad company.....	Ora L. Wright.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
Attorneys.....	Wright, Call & Hubbard.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	F. W. Ackley.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
General Freight Agent.....	W. B. McNider.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
General Passenger Agent.....	W. B. McNider.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
Receiver.....	Warwick Hough.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Treasurer for Receivers.....	S. J. Beals.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
Land Commissioners.....	Geo. W. Oakley.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
Auditor for Receivers.....	F. A. Seaman.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
	John K. Lee.....	Sioux City, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
A. T. Call.....	Sioux City, Iowa.	H. S. Baker.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
W. P. Manley.....	Sioux City, Iowa.	W. P. Clough.....	St. Paul, Minn.
G. W. Oakley.....	Sioux City, Iowa.	C. J. Stevens.....	St. Paul, Minn.
F. A. Seaman.....	Sioux City, Iowa.	C. L. Wright.....	Sioux City, Iowa.
S. J. Beals.....	Sioux City, Iowa.		

## TABOR &amp; NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

## 1. Railroad line represented by capital stock: a Main line.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of named.
	FROM—	TO—		
1. a Tabor & Northern railway.....	Tabor, Iowa.....	Malvern, Iowa.	8.79	8.79
Total.....				8.79

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board.....	Robert McClelland.....	Tabor, Iowa.
President.....	Robert McClelland.....	Tabor, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	Thomas McClelland.....	Tabor, Iowa.
Secretary.....	H. Claude Dye.....	Tabor, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	H. Claude Dye.....	Tabor, Iowa.
Auditor.....	F. M. Hamling.....	Tabor, Iowa.
Traffic Manager.....	Charles K. Wilson.....	Omaha, Neb.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Robert McClelland.....	Omaha, Neb.	J. M. Barbour.....	Tabor, Iowa.
Thomas McClelland.....	Forest Grove, Ore.		

## LINES OPERATED BY THE WABASH RAILROAD COMPANY.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of named.	MILES OPERATED IN EACH STATE.								Total.
	FROM—	TO—			Michigan.	Ohio.	Indiana.	Illinois.	Missouri.	Iowa.	Dominion of Canada.	New York.	
LINES OWNED— The Wabash railroad.	Toledo.....	East Hannibal.....	462.3	462.3		75.7165	219.8						462.3
	Bluffs.....	Camp Point.....	39.4	39.4			39.4						39.4
	Clayton.....	Evaston.....	34.5	34.5			34.5						34.5
	Decatur.....	East St. Louis.....	110.2	110.2			110.2						110.2
	Edgemoor.....	Edgemoor.....	10.3	10.3			10.3						10.3
	Auburn Junction.....	Edgemoor.....	295.4	295.4			295.4						295.4
	Shawnee.....	Altamont.....	10.3	10.3			10.3						10.3
	Fairbury.....	Streator.....	31.5	31.5			31.5						31.5
	Delaware.....	Delaware.....	149.2	149.2			149.2						149.2
	St. Louis (Taylor Ave.).....	Harlem.....	274.8	274.8			274.8						274.8
	St. Louis (Carr Street).....	Ferguson.....	10.8	10.8			10.8						10.8
	Moberly.....	Ottumwa.....	131.2	131.2			131.2						131.2
	Salsbury.....	Glasgow.....	15.3	15.3			15.3						15.3
	Total.....		1,594.0	1,594.0	75.0114	931.1	3,659.6	889.0	43.3				1,594.0
	Pittsfield Junction.....	Pittsfield.....	6.1	6.1			6.1						6.1
	Chicago.....	Chicago.....	9.5	9.5			9.5						9.5
	Brussels.....	Chillicothe.....	38.2	38.2			38.2						38.2
	St. Louis, Council Bluffs & O. E. R. R. ....	Patonsburg.....	41.4	41.4			41.4						41.4
	Boone County & Booneville railroad.....	Columbia.....	21.6	21.6			21.6						21.6
LINES OPERATED UNDER CHARTER AGREEMENTS— Grand Trunk railroad. Erie railroad. Detroit Union Depot and Station Co. and Fort Street Union Depot Co. Chicago & Western Indiana railroad. Chicago & Calumet Terminal R. R. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Chicago, Peoria & Western railroad. Toledo, Peoria & Western railroad.	Windsor.....	Windsor.....	225.4	225.4									225.4
	Windsor Junction.....	Windsor Junction.....	25.6	25.6									25.6
	Suspension Bridge.....	Suspension Bridge.....	4.6	4.6									4.6
	Detroit (union depot).....	Detroit.....	13.0	13.0									13.0
	Chicago (Grand & Ill.).....	Auburn Junction.....	11.8	11.8									11.8
	St. Louis (Grand & Ill.).....	State Line (Ind. & Ill.).....	5.7	5.7									5.7
	Clark Junction.....	Quincy.....	21.8	21.8									21.8
	Camp Point.....	Hamilton.....	6.5	6.5									6.5
	Evaston.....	Fairbury.....	5.3	5.3									5.3
	Forrest.....	Forrest.....	5.3	5.3									5.3
	Total.....		311.0	311.0	103.7	6.1	101.2						311.0
	Total.....		1,905.0	1,905.0	175.7	99.9	3,760.8	889.0	43.3				1,905.0



## LINES OPERATED BY THE WABASH RAILROAD COMPANY—CONTINUED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of railroad.	MILES OPERATED IN EACH STATE.							
	FROM—	TO—			Michigan.	Ohio.	Indiana.	Illinois.	Missouri.	Iowa.	Domino of Canada.	New York.
Terminal R. R. Ass'n of St. Louis..	St. Louis (U. station)	Twenty-third Street..	7									
Hannibal & St. Joseph railroad.	Harlem	Kansas City.	1.5									
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific R. R.	Ottumwa	Harvey	38.0									
Missouri, Kansas & Texas railroad.	Hannibal	Moberly..	70.0									
Missouri Pacific railway	St. Louis (Olive St.)	Carr Street..	.6									
Total				446.2	4.6	5.7	53.6	72.8	38.0	345.9	25.6	446.2
LINES BELONGING TO PURCHASING COMMITTEE.												
Attica, Covington & Southern R. R.	Attica	Covington	14.8									14.8
Champaign branch.	Champaign	Sidney	11.7				11.7					11.7
*Des Moines & St. Louis railroad.	Harvey	Des Moines	43.4						43.4			43.4
Total				69.9			14.8	11.7		43.4		69.9
Total mileage operated.				2,321.1		80.5	114.9	435.5	731.0	563.0	124.7	2,321.1

\* The line from Albia to Harvey, 23.4 miles, is now being operated, and the mileage is not included above This is a part of the Des Moines & St. Louis railroad and belongs to the purchasing committee.

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
Chairman of the Board	O. D. Ashley	New York City.
President	O. D. Ashley	New York City.
Vice-President	Edgar T. Welles	New York City.
Vice-President	J. Ramsey, Jr.	St. Louis, Mo.
Secretary	J. C. Otreson	New York City.
Treasurer	F. L. O'Leary	St. Louis, Mo.
Attorney, or General Solicitor	Wells H. Blodgett	St. Louis, Mo.
Attorney, or General Counsel	Wells H. Blodgett	St. Louis, Mo.
Auditor	D. B. Howard	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant Auditor	E. H. Pryor	St. Louis, Mo.
General Manager	J. Ramsey, Jr.	St. Louis, Mo.
Chief Engineer	W. S. Lincoln	St. Louis, Mo.
General Superintendent	H. L. Magee	St. Louis, Mo.
Division Superintendent	E. A. Gould	Penn. Ind.
Division Superintendent	W. A. Garrett	Decatur, Ill.
Division Superintendent	J. S. Goodrich	Moberly, Mo.
Superintendent of Telegraph	G. C. Kinsman	Decatur, Ill.
Freight Traffic Manager	M. Knight	St. Louis, Mo.
General Freight Agent	S. B. Knight	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant General Freight Agent	P. W. Coyle	St. Louis, Mo.
General Passenger Agent	O. S. Crane	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant General Passenger Agent	H. V. P. Taylor	St. Louis, Mo.
General Ticket Agent	O. S. Crane	St. Louis, Mo.
Assistant General Ticket Agent	H. V. P. Taylor	St. Louis, Mo.
General Baggage Agent	S. H. Overholt	St. Louis, Mo.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
O. D. Ashley	New York City.	Edwin Gould	New York City.
Geo. J. Gould	New York City.	Thos. H. Hubbard	New York City.
Edgar T. Welles	New York City.	John T. Terry	New York City.
Henry K. McHarg	New York City.	Russell Sage	New York City.
O. J. Lawrence	New York City.	O. C. Macrae	London, England.
P. B. Wyckoff	New York City.	Francis Pavy	London, England.
L. O. Reynolds	Toledo, Ohio.		

## WINONA &amp; WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.
	FROM—	TO—	
Winona & Western Railway company	Winona, Minn.	Osage, Iowa.	113.2

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President	H. W. Lamberton	Winona, Minn.
Vice-President	V. Simpson	Winona, Minn.
Secretary	Thos. Simpson	Winona, Minn.
Treasurer	M. G. Norton	Winona, Minn.
Assistant Treasurer	S. S. Strouse	Winona, Minn.
Attorney, or General Counsel	Thos. Simpson	Winona, Minn.
General Superintendent	J. J. Mahoney	Winona, Minn.
General Freight Agent	J. J. Mahoney	Winona, Minn.
General Passenger Agent	J. J. Mahoney	Winona, Minn.



## WINONA &amp; WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—CONTINUED.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
Verrazano Simpson.....	Winona, Minn.	S. W. Hamilton.....	Winona, Minn.
Henry W. Lambertson.....	Winona, Minn.	W. J. Landon.....	Winona, Minn.
Matthew G. Norton.....	Winona, Minn.	Earl S. Youmans.....	Winona, Minn.
Wm. H. Laird.....	Winona, Minn.	Charles Horton.....	Winona, Minn.
J. E. Mitchell.....	Winona, Minn.		

## BURLINGTON &amp; NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.
	FROM—	TO—	
Burlington & Northwestern Railway company....	Mediapolis. ....	Washington.....	33.73
The company has leased the right to run over 13.77 miles of the B. O. R. & N. W., the distance between Burlington and Mediapolis.....			13.77
Total.....			52.50

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	T. W. Barhydt.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Vice-President.....	J. T. Remey.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Secretary.....	R. M. Green.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	R. M. Green.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Attorney or General Counsel.....	H. A. Kelly.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Auditor, Chief Clerk Acct. Dept.....	K. M. Boden.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Manager.....	R. Law.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	W. A. Barton.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Traffic Clerk.....	M. Law.....	Burlington, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
T. W. Barhydt.....	Burlington, Iowa.	O. P. Squires.....	Burlington, Iowa.
J. T. Remey.....	Burlington, Iowa.	H. B. Scott.....	Burlington, Iowa.
W. W. Baldwin.....	Burlington, Iowa.	H. S. Rand.....	Burlington, Iowa.
W. T. McFarland.....	Burlington, Iowa.	Wm. Carson.....	Burlington, Iowa.
J. W. Blythe.....	Burlington, Iowa.		

## BURLINGTON &amp; WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

## PROPERTY OPERATED.

NAME.	TERMINALS.		Miles of line for each road named.	Miles of line for each class of r-r's named.
	FROM—	TO—		
Burlington & Western Railway company..	Winfield.....	Oskaloosa.....		70.70
This company has, by payment of its proportion of joint expense of train service and track repairs, the right to run over the B. & N. W. railway from Winfield to Mediapolis.....			19.73	
And thence to Burlington over the B. O. R. & N. W. Co.'s line under contract of the B. & N. W. R'y Co. with that company....			13.77	
Total.....				104.20

## OFFICERS.

TITLE.	NAME.	LOCATION OF OFFICE.
President.....	T. W. Barhydt.....	Burlington, Iowa.
First Vice-President.....	O. P. Squires.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Secretary.....	R. M. Green.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Treasurer.....	R. M. Green.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Attorney or General Counsel.....	W. L. Cooper.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Auditor, Chief Clerk Accountant Department..	K. M. Boden.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Manager.....	R. Law.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Superintendent of Telegraph.....	W. A. Barton.....	Burlington, Iowa.
Traffic Clerk.....	M. Law.....	Burlington, Iowa.

## DIRECTORS.

NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.	NAME.	POSTOFFICE ADDRESS.
T. W. Barhydt.....	Burlington, Iowa.	J. W. Blythe.....	Burlington, Iowa.
O. P. Squires.....	Burlington, Iowa.	H. B. Scott.....	Burlington, Iowa.
W. W. Baldwin.....	Burlington, Iowa.		



---

SYLLABI OF DECISIONS OF INTERSTATE  
COMMERCE COMMISSION.

---



## SYLLABI OF DECISIONS

### OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

EDWARD KEMBLE

v.

} Export rates.

BOSTON & ALBANY RAILROAD COMPANY AND OTHERS.  
Decided March 7, 1896.

*First.*—It is not, as matter of law, a violation of the act to regulate commerce to make a lower rate to the port of export upon traffic which is exported than upon that which is locally consumed, for the export rate is in essence the division of a through rate.

*Second.*—The decision of the commission in *New York Board of Trade & Transportation v. Pennsylvania R. Co. et al.* having been overruled by the United States supreme court in *Texas & Pacific Railway Co. v. Interstate Commerce Commission*, 162 U. S. 197, 40 L. ed. 940, 5 Inters. Com. Rep. 405, it follows that carriers are not, as a matter of law, prohibited from making rates from points in the United States to points in foreign countries, or from points in foreign countries to points in the United States, of which the inland division or share accruing to carriers within the United States is less than the tariff rate of such carriers on domestic shipments of similar commodities.

*Third.*—Through tariffs showing total charges on export traffic from interior points in the United States to destinations in foreign countries cannot owing to the fluctuation in ocean rates, usually be determined and published in accordance with section six of the act to regulate commerce; and if the inland carrier publishes and maintains its division of the through export rate it apparently does all that it can do, and all that it is required to do under that section; but if the inland carrier, instead of receiving a fixed inland division, makes through rates in fact of which its division fluctuates, a question arises as to the publication of such rates, which is not passed upon in this proceeding. *New York, New Haven & Hartford R. Co. v. Platt*, 7 Inters. Com. Rep. 333, cited and distinguished.

*Fourth.*—Import and export traffic is not removed from the jurisdiction of the commission by the decision of the United States supreme court in *Texas & Pacific Railway Co. v. Interstate Commerce Commission*, 162 U. S. 197, 40 L. ed. 940, 5 Inters. Com. Rep. 405, but, on the contrary, the effect of that decision is to extend such jurisdiction; and the commission has full authority to pass upon the grievance of any individual or locality which is alleged to arise from rates upon export or import goods as compared with rates on domestic merchandise.

*Fifth.*—Defendants make two rates on grain and sixth class merchandise from Chicago to Boston. If the commodity is for local consumption the rate is 2 cents above the rate to New York; but if the commodity is to be exported the Boston rate is the same as the New York rate. The export traffic is delivered to the ocean carrier at East Boston, which is a few miles more distant than Boston from Chicago, and the export rate, which is essentially the inland carrier's division of a through export rate, applies in fact only to East Boston. The domestic rate to Boston is substantially as fixed by the commission in *Kemble v. Lake Shore & Michigan Southern R. Co.* 3 Inters. Com. Rep. 830, 5 I. C. C. Rep. 166. Whether, as a matter of fact, the domestic rate to Boston is unreasonably high, or whether the export rate through Boston unduly discriminates against Boston, are questions which were involved in cases heretofore decided by the commission; and their reconsideration in this case is not warranted by any facts developed at the hearing. Held, That the fourth section is not violated by the lower export rate to East Boston than the domestic rate for the shorter distance to Boston, and that the petition should be dismissed.



THE BOARD OF TRADE OF THE CITY OF DAWSON, GA.,

v.

THE CENTRAL OF GEORGIA RAILWAY COMPANY AND  
THE GEORGIA & ALABAMA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Relative rates.

Decided March 27, 1899.

Upon complaint that defendants violate the act to regulate commerce by charging higher freight rates to Dawson, Ga., than to Eufaula, Ala., and Americus and Albany, Ga., towns in the section of country surrounding Dawson, and after giving full and due consideration to the conditions and circumstances, including situation of the localities, possible transportation via the Chattahoochee river, railway competition and the competition of markets, and the basing-point system of rate making as practiced in the south; held, (1) That it is undue preference for the Central of Georgia Railway company to charge any higher rates on freight from New York or other eastern cities to Dawson than those which are maintained from the same points of shipment to Eufaula. (2) That it is undue preference for the Central of Georgia Railway company or the Georgia & Alabama Railway company to charge any higher rates on freight from Nashville, Cincinnati and Chattanooga to Dawson than those in effect from the same points to Albany. (3) That it is undue preference for the Central of Georgia or Georgia & Alabama to charge any higher rates on freight from New Orleans to Dawson than those which are in force from New Orleans to Americus or Albany. (4) That so long as the southern basing-point system of rate making is adhered to, it is undue preference for the Central of Georgia or the Georgia & Alabama to charge any higher freight rates to Dawson than those which may be in effect to Americus from any of the points of shipment above mentioned.

IN THE MATTER OF ALLEGED UNLAWFUL RATES AND  
PRACTICES IN THE TRANSPORTATION OF COTTON BY  
THE KANSAS CITY, MEMPHIS & BIRMINGHAM RAIL-  
ROAD COMPANY AND OTHERS.

Floating cotton.

Decided March 27, 1899.

First.—Defendants' rates on cotton from Memphis to Atlantic and gulf ports and various eastern cities are lower than those from intermediate cotton-shipping stations; but whether such rates violate the fourth section of the act to regulate commerce is not determinable upon the record as made in this case.

Second.—In the practice of "floating cotton," the essential transportation feature is carrying the cotton to a compress, receiving it again in the compressed state and transporting it to destination at the through rate in force from the point of origin. The practice benefits both the railroad company and the producer, and tends to place noncompetitive points upon an equality with more distant competitive localities from which lower rates are in force. It does not unjustly discriminate against dealers in the city of Memphis, who decline to take advantage of the privilege. The cotton is graded as well as compressed at the point of stoppage. The destination of the cotton is usually changed at the compress point; the identity of a cotton shipment is not preserved at the point of grading and compression, and the ownership of the cotton may change at the compress station. The question is whether the shipment is to be considered through and entitled to a through rate, or as local and calling for application of charges in effect to and from the compress point. Held, (1) That the carrier may, as part of a contract for through shipment, allow the cotton to be stopped off for the purpose of grading and compression; but the privilege enters into and becomes part of the service covered by the rate, and should be specified in the published tariffs. (2) That the determinative feature of a through shipment is the contract, and if the cotton starts and proceeds upon a contract for through shipment, as is shown to be the fact in this case, it may be considered as a through shipment and be given the benefit of a through rate. In the Matter of Alleged Unlawful Rates and Practices in the Transportation of Grain and Grain Products by the Atchafalaya, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company and Others, 7 I. C. C. Rep., 240, cited and distinguished.

DALLAS FREIGHT BUREAU

v.

TEXAS &amp; PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY AND OTHERS.

Reasonable rate on cotton: Long and short haul.

Decided June 23, 1898.

First.—Upon complaint that a rate of 75 cents per hundred pounds on cotton from Dallas, Texas, to New Orleans, La., is unreasonable and should not exceed 55 cents per hundred pounds, it appeared that such rate also applied as a common-point rate from substantially all the cultivated portion of Texas, and that reduction of the rate from Dallas would involve corresponding reductions from nearly the whole state; that the rate to New Orleans is determined by adding a differential of 10 cents to the rate to Galveston, and that such differential is reasonable; that the Texas railroad commission fixes the Galveston rate, and has reduced such rate from 65 to 60 cents during the pendency of this proceeding, such action resulting, under maintenance of the differential, in like reduction of the rate to New Orleans; that about 65 per cent of Texas cotton passes through Galveston and about 25 per cent through New Orleans, and reducing only the New Orleans rate would result in diverting more of the traffic from the port of Galveston. Held, That while the rate from Dallas to New Orleans does not appear to be altogether reasonable, the commission is not satisfied, in view of the control exercised and the action taken by the Texas commission, that it ought to interfere with the present adjustment.

Second.—Circumstances and conditions governing the transportation of freight articles by defendants from New Orleans, La., to Kansas City, Mo., and to Dallas, Texas, an intermediate point on the same line, are rendered substantially dissimilar by the competition of carriers by water and rail from New Orleans to Kansas City, which controls and affects the rates, and defendants' present higher charges for the shorter distance to Dallas (which are conceded to be reasonable in themselves) are not in violation of section 4 of the act to regulate commerce.

CATTLE RAISERS' ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS

v.

FORT WORTH & DENVER CITY RAILWAY COMPANY AND  
OTHERS.

Terminal charge on live stock.

Decided August 4, 1898.

Defendants filed petition for rehearing, alleging error in the conclusions set forth in the report and opinion of the commission, wherein it was held that a terminal charge of \$3 per car imposed by defendant carriers at Chicago for delivery of live stock at the Union stock yards in that city is unreasonable and unjust, and that exaction of more than \$1 per car for such service is unlawful under section 1 of the act to regulate commerce. Held, Upon hearing of the parties and reconsideration of the record, that there was no error in the original determination; and, further, that the charge complained of and any charge for the terminal service at Chicago in excess of \$1 per car constitutes undue prejudice to Chicago under section 3 of the statute.

IN THE MATTER OF RELATIVE RATES UPON EXPORT  
AND DOMESTIC TRAFFIC IN GRAIN AND GRAIN PRO-  
DUCTS AND OF THE PUBLICATION OF TARIFFS  
RELATING TO SUCH TRAFFIC.

Export and domestic rates.

Decided August 7, 1899.

First.—The act to regulate commerce applies to the transportation of export and import traffic, and the jurisdiction of the commission over such traffic is not denied, but is distinctly affirmed and rather enlarged by the decision of the United States supreme court in Texas & Pacific Railroad Company v. Interstate Commerce Commission, 162 U. S., 197, 40 L. ed. 940, 5 Inters. Com. Rep. 405.

Second.—The act to regulate commerce does not, as matter of law, prohibit a carrier by railroad from making a through rate from a point within the United States to a foreign destination of which its division shall be less than the amount charged by it for the corresponding transportation of domestic merchandise to the port of export. Nor is it, as matter



of law, in violation of the act for such carrier to make a lower rate to the port of export upon traffic which is exported than upon that which is locally consumed, for the export rate is in essence the division of a through rate. *Texas & Pacific Railroad Company v. Interstate Commerce Commission*, 162 U. S. 197, 40 L. ed. 940, 5 Inters. Com. Rep. 405, cited and applied. *Kemble v. Boston & Albany Railroad Company*, 8 I. C. C. Rep. 110, cited and approved.

*Third*.—It is a question of fact whether rates upon export or import traffic, as well as those upon domestic traffic, are in contravention of the provisions of the act to regulate commerce.

*Fourth*.—The act to regulate commerce was intended to and does apply, not only in cases of direct injury to particular individuals or industries, but also in cases involving indirect injury to the community as a whole, and in the absence of some justifying reason, it would not be right for American railroads to permanently transact business for foreigners at a less rate than that for which they render a corresponding service to American citizens.

*Fifth*.—Market conditions, sometimes in wheat, but seldom in case of corn, may justify an export rate through the port of New York somewhat lower than the domestic rate, and Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk and Newport News usually take rates which are certain differentials below the New York rate on both domestic and export traffic. During the period of closed lake navigation the export and domestic grain rates to New York and the other ports mentioned should ordinarily be the same. Rates to other ports, including Boston and ports on the Atlantic north of Boston, and Galveston, New Orleans and other gulf ports may perhaps be properly made lower on export than on domestic traffic to enable them to compete for the export business. Such an adjustment of rates would be to the advantage of the carrier, and just alike to the American consumer and the American producer. But as the problem is primarily one for the carriers rather than this commission, and some rate changes have been made by them during the progress of this proceeding, and the testimony indicates that the present disparities between domestic and export rates will not become permanent, no order is made in relation to this branch of the case.

*Sixth*.—In the application of export grain rates the carriers should in no case make the rate from any point to the seaboard less than that from any intermediate point on the same line.

*Seventh*.—Carriers engaged in the transportation of export flour from Minneapolis at a rate which is  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents less than the domestic rate to the port of exports refuse to make any corresponding concessions to intermediate millers. Held, That this is unjust and unlawful discrimination against such intermediate traffic, and that whatever line participates in such lower export rate on flour from Minneapolis must make a corresponding rate upon similar traffic from intermediate points.

*Eighth*.—There may be instances where a carrier should be permitted to meet railroad competition without reference to its intermediate territory, but when the very existence of an important industry depends upon the carrier being required to treat intermediate territory as it does the more distant territory, the rule of no greater charge for the shorter distance clearly applies.

*Ninth*.—Carriers largely engaged in transporting export flour have for many years made the same rate on wheat and flour, and such long continued practice is evidence against any difference in rate on those commodities; but the presumption is not irrebuttable, for if it were the carriers could never change their tariffs or classifications.

*Tenth*.—The profit to American millers in manufacturing flour for export is from 1 to 3 cents per 100 pounds, but the freight rates on wheat and flour for export show a difference in favor of the English miller of from 4 to 11 cents per 100 pounds, and, other things being equal, such discrimination is clearly prohibitive upon the American manufacturer. The published railroad rates on both wheat and flour for export have been the same up to a recent period, and the carriers have exacted such rates except where lower rates on wheat were induced by competition. Water competition on the Great Lakes limits rail rates to the various ports on both wheat and flour during the navigation season, and to a degree before the opening and after the close of navigation, and the published and actual water rates on wheat have been from 2 to 4 cents lower than those on flour. To a limited extent the cost of service may be greater in the transportation of export flour than in that of export wheat. The export rate on flour includes delivery on board ship, while the rate on wheat ordinarily does not, and at New York an additional charge of about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents per bushel for loading wheat is made. Exportation of flour has steadily increased, but for the last six years the increase has not been marked, and a decrease is shown by comparing exports in 1894 and 1898.

Held (1) That public policy and good railroad policy alike seem to require the same rate on export wheat and export flour, but that the duties of the commission are confined to administering the act to regulate commerce, and in view of all the conditions shown in the investigation a somewhat higher rate on export flour than on export wheat is not in violation of that

statute. (2) That the published difference in rates is too wide, and that the rate on flour for export should not exceed that upon export wheat by more than 2 cents per 100 pounds. (3) That the relation of rates on domestic shipments of flour and wheat is not involved in this decision, as the export and domestic freights are handled under different conditions.

*Eleventh*.—Rates on export traffic must be published and filed in accordance with the provisions of section six of the act to regulate commerce.

*Twelfth*.—So-called through export rates made by adding the ocean rate, whatever it may be, to the inland rail rate, whatever it may be, are not analogous to joint rates made by joint arrangement between railway carriers subject to the statute in the sense that the total rate must be published and filed, and it is enough if the railway carrier publishes and maintains its own rate to the seaboard. But if there is in fact such a joint arrangement that the rate is a joint rate under the sixth section of the act to regulate commerce, then the entire through rate should be published, and not the inland division, which in that case might vary while the entire rate remains the same.

IN THE MATTER OF EXPORT RATES FROM POINTS EAST  
AND WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER. } Export rates on corn.

Decided April 12, 1899.

*First*.—It is neither sound in principle nor equitable in practice for railway lines to create artificial differences in market conditions by an arbitrary differential in rates whereby the product of one section of the country is assigned to one market and the product of another section of the country to another market.

*Second*.—In 1898 defendants' rates to New York on export corn were 19 cents per hundred pounds from Peoria and  $17\frac{1}{2}$  cents from Chicago; and from the Mississippi river the  $17\frac{1}{2}$ -cent Chicago rate applied as a proportional rate on export corn coming from west of that river. In January and February, 1899, the proportionable rate from the river was made  $13\frac{1}{2}$  cents, a reduction of 4 cents, the Chicago rate was made 16 cents, and the Peoria rate  $17\frac{1}{2}$  cents, a reduction of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents. This rate from the river has always been higher, or at least no lower, than the rate from Chicago. Higher rates are in effect on export corn originating at the river crossings, and local and proportional rates considerably above the proportional export rate are also in force from river points on domestic shipments. Under former rates Illinois corn went forward freely for export through Atlantic ports, but under present rates it is stored in elevators or cribbed upon the farms, while Iowa corn moves in large quantities across Illinois farms and through Illinois markets on its way to the seaboard and foreign points. Large quantities of corn are held in store at Chicago and Peoria. Through rates to the Atlantic seaboard apply from a large number of points in Illinois, but from numerous other localities in that state the corn must be shipped under local rates to and from points like Chicago and Peoria. Some of these through rates and many of the combination rates are higher than through or combination rates on export corn from points in Iowa. Facts relating to competition of routes leading to gulf ports and to application of "transit rates" on export corn are stated.

Held (1) That through or total combination tariff rates on export corn from points in Illinois, which are higher than the through or combination rate on corn from any point in Iowa, are unlawful under section 3 of the act to regulate commerce. (2) That the evidence is not sufficient to enable the commission to determine what, if any, other correction should be made in the present rate relations, and that the boards of trade of Chicago and Peoria, complainants herein, have leave to apply for further hearing in regard to the effect of the changes made by defendants in the general rate adjustment.

*Third*.—The propriety of present rates in force on Iowa export corn is not considered; and no opinion is expressed concerning the legality of the "transit system" as allowed at Mississippi river crossings, Peoria and Chicago, nor as to whether the statute sanctions a system of local and proportional rates on domestic and export shipments from the Mississippi river; which results in four different rates on corn from the east bank of that river to the Atlantic seaboard.

*Fourth*.—When rates established to apply between points within a single state are applied as part of combination rates on transportation between different states, such state rates, as well as the interstate rates with which they are combined, must be published at stations and filed with the commission as provided in section 6 of the act to regulate commerce.



LISTMAN MILL COMPANY

v.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE &amp; ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Milling rates.

Decided August 18, 1898.

*First.*—Defendant's charges on grain originating at points on its Southern Minnesota division, milled in transit at La Crosse, Wis., and forwarded as product to Milwaukee or Chicago are not more than  $\frac{3}{4}$  cents per 100 pounds in excess of its wheat rates from the same points of origin to Milwaukee or Chicago, and such milling rates at La Crosse, as related to defendant's wheat rates, or as affecting the competitive relations of complainant with millers at Milwaukee, are not unjust or otherwise unlawful.

*Second.*—La Crosse is on a direct route from points on defendant's Southern Minnesota division to Milwaukee or Chicago, and Minneapolis is not, but the short line distances from points on that division are considerably less to La Crosse. Defendant's charges on wheat from Southern Minnesota division points to La Crosse and Minneapolis are the same, and its rates on flour from those cities to Milwaukee or Chicago are also the same, but La Crosse has milling or transit rates which are less than the sum of such locals, while at Minneapolis shipments to and from the mills are made under established in and out charges. Transit rates at La Crosse on wheat from points on said division to Milwaukee or Chicago bear the same relation to wheat rates from such points than the rates on wheat in and on flour out of Minneapolis bear to grain rates from points on defendant's more northerly Hastings & Dakota division. Alterations in any of defendant's flour rates from Minneapolis are followed by corresponding changes in transit rates at La Crosse. The legality of milling in transit rates is not involved, and what, if any, prejudice results to complainant under transit milling at La Crosse and regular in and out rates at Minneapolis is not shown. Held, That no undue prejudice results to La Crosse or the complaining miller in that city from milling rates enforced by defendant at La Crosse, or the relations of such rates to those established by defendant for Minneapolis.

PHILLIPS, BAILEY & CO; STRATTON, SEAY & STRATTON;  
CHEEK, WEBB & CO.; ORR, HUME & CO.; R. F. WEAR-  
LEY & CO.; ORR, JACKSON & CO.; J. COONEY & CO.;  
JACKSON, MATHEWS & HARRIS; KIRKPATRICK & CO.

v.

THE LOUISVILLE & NASHVILLE RAILROAD COMPANY;  
THE NEW ORLEANS & NORTHEASTERN RAILROAD  
COMPANY; THE ALABAMA GREAT SOUTHERN RAIL-  
ROAD COMPANY; THE CINCINNATI, NEW ORLEANS &  
TEXAS PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, and S. M. FEL-  
TON, the receiver thereof; THE NASHVILLE, CHATTA-  
NOOGA & ST. LOUIS RAILWAY COMPANY; THE  
ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY; THE CHESA-  
PEAKE, OHIO & SOUTHWESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY,  
and JOHN ECHOLES and ST. JOHN BOYCE, the recep-  
vers thereof; THE SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Longer and shorter hauls, undue preference.

*First.*—Where carriers exact higher rates for a shorter than a longer haul over the same line in the same direction, the shorter haul being included within the longer, they are amenable, not only under section four, but also under sections one and three, of the act to regulate commerce.

*Second.*—Where two merchants of two localities compete for business in the same territory, discrimination in rates in favor of the one and against the other locality necessarily gives the former an advantage and works a prejudice to the latter in that competition.

*Third.*—The exaction of as high rates for a shorter haul as for a longer haul over the same line in the same direction, the shorter haul being included within the longer, is itself a discrimination, and, if not justified by a substantial dissimilarity of circumstances and conditions, is an unjust discrimination.

*Fourth.*—In respect to competition as justifying discrimination, the supreme court of the United States has only gone to the extent of holding that it "may in some cases" be such as, "having due regard to the interests of the public and of the carrier, ought justly to have effect upon rates," and that "the mere fact of competition, no matter what its character or extent," does not "necessarily relieve carriers from the restraints of the third and fourth

sections" of the act to regulate commerce. *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Alabama Midland Railroad Company*, 168 U. S. 164, 167, 42 L. ed. 432, 433.

*Fifth.*—The supreme court of the United States, while denying power in the interstate commerce commission to enforce the provision of section 1 of the act to regulate commerce—namely, that all rate charges "shall be reasonable and just"—by orders prescribing reasonable maximum rates, expressly recognizes the authority and duty of the commission to enforce sections 2, 3 and 4 of the act. *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Cincinnati, N. O. & T. P. R. Co.*, 167 U. S. 506, 42 L. ed. 256.

*Sixth.*—The burden is upon the carrier, in all cases where a departure from the rule of the law is proved, to show clearly that this departure is justified. It is not sufficient to raise a mere doubt. "Where the matter is not clear, the object and policy of the law should prevail." *Missouri P. R. Co. v. Texas & P. R. Co.*, 31 Fed. Rep., 863, 4 Inters. Com. Rep., 434.

*Seventh.*—"Whether the circumstances and conditions of carriage have been substantially similar or otherwise are questions of fact depending on the matters proved in each case." *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Alabama Midland R. Co.*, 168 U. S. 170, 42 L. ed. 424; *Missouri P. R. Co. v. Texas & P. R. Co.*, 31 Fed. Rep., 863, 4 Inters. Com. Rep., 434.

*Eighth.*—While it may be in this case that as high rates on sugar and molasses for the shorter haul from New Orleans to Nashville than for the longer hauls to Louisville are justified, the evidence does not show such a substantial dissimilarity of circumstances and conditions as will authorize higher rates on such transportation to Nashville than are charged to Louisville.

BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

v.

ATCHISON, TOPEKA &amp; SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY ET AL.

Relative rates on grain and grain products—greater charge for shorter than for longer haul.

Decided November 1, 1899.

*First.*—Distance is undoubtedly a factor, and perhaps ought to be a much more important factor, in the determination of rates, but, in the present case, where the distances from the grain fields of Kansas to Kansas City, St. Louis and Galveston vary from 100 to 1,000 miles, any attempt to adjust the rates on grain to those cities upon the sole basis of the rate per ton per mile would be impracticable.

*Second.*—A decision by the commission in one case is not necessarily controlling in all similar cases. Such decision hardly has the effect of an estoppel, and there is not the same reason for applying the maxim *stare decisis* which exists in courts of law. But when the relation in freight rates determines where and how business should be done, the decisions of this commission fixing or approving a given relation should only be reversed for imperative reasons.

*Third.*—The changes which have taken place in conditions governing the transportation of wheat and flour from Kansas points to destinations in Texas, although they have been material in some respects, are not sufficient to warrant interference in this case with the differential making the rate 5 cents higher on flour than on wheat, which was approved by the commission in *Kauffman Milling Co. v. Missouri P. R. Co.*, 4 I. O. C. Rep., 417, 3 Inters. Com. Rep., 400.

*Fourth.*—Carriers of corn and cornmeal from Kansas points to destinations in Texas enforce a differential of 7 cents per 100 pounds more on cornmeal than on corn, and such difference prohibits the shipment of cornmeal ground at Kansas points into Texas territory. The difference in cost of service need not exceed 3 cents per 100 pounds, and the difference in value, greater liability to injury and other conditions surrounding the transportation of such commodities do not justify the greater difference in the rate. Held, That the difference in rate of 7 cents against cornmeal and in favor of corn unjustly discriminates against Kansas millers, and that the differential should not exceed 3 cents per 100 pounds.

*Fifth.*—Several defendant carriers engaged in transporting wheat and corn from points in Kansas and Missouri and intermediate points to Galveston and New Orleans make lower export rates on those commodities from Kansas City, Mo., or points in that vicinity, than from some of the intermediate stations on their respective lines. These export rates are much lower than the corresponding domestic rates, in case of which the fourth section is invariably observed. The circumstances and conditions governing transportation of grain



from the longer and shorter distance points are not substantially dissimilar. Held, That the higher rates from such intermediate points subject those localities to undue prejudice, and that if the carriers are allowed to make these low export rates, they should in making them treat all intermediate territory alike, and desist henceforth from charging higher rates from the nearer stations than those in effect from the more distant points.

*Sixth.*—In view of present conditions, no opinion is expressed as to the reasonableness of export grain rates from Kansas points to Galveston, or the reasonableness of local grain rates from Kansas and Missouri into Texas, or the relation of eastbound and southbound export rates from Kansas points.

IN THE MATTER OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE ACT TO  
REGULATE COMMERCE BY THE ST. LOUIS & SAN FRAN- } *Greater charge for shorter than for*  
CISCO RAILWAY COMPANY. } *longer hauls, undue preference.*

Decided November 1, 1899.

*First.*—The greater charge enforced by the respondent company for the shorter distance from Marshfield, Mo., than for the longer distance from Springfield and other more westerly stations, in the transportation of live poultry in carloads to Chicago, constitutes a departure from the general rule of the fourth section, which the carrier was bound to justify in this proceeding.

*Second.*—The higher rate from an intermediate locality to a common destination also constitutes a prejudice to that locality and shippers and traffic therefrom, and a preference to the more distant localities and shippers and traffic therefrom, which, if found to be without sufficient excuse, must be held unreasonable and undue, and therefore in contravention of the third section.

*Third.*—Respondent is engaged with other carriers in the through transportation to Chicago of freight from numerous points on its road, including Springfield and Marshfield, and it cannot lawfully call itself merely a local carrier from Marshfield, while engaged in through carriage from Springfield and other points on its line, and thereby justify higher rates to Chicago for the shorter distance from Marshfield than for the longer distance from Springfield and more distant points of shipment. *Cincinnati, N. O. & T. P. R. Co. v. Interstate Commerce Commission*, 162 U. S. 184, 40 L. ed. 935, 5 Inters. Com. Rep. 391, 16 Sup. Ct. Rep. 700, cited and applied.

*Fourth.*—The rates enforced by the respondent company on live poultry in carloads to Chicago are higher from Marshfield than for the longer distances from Springfield and other more distant stations on its line, to and including Columbus, Kans. It meets the competition of other roads at Springfield and various junctions to the west of Springfield, yet nowhere west of Springfield does the respondent or any of its competitors make the greater charge for a shorter than for a longer distance on this traffic. Such rates on live poultry from Springfield and points west thereof are not unreasonably low. The respondent makes as low a rate to St. Louis from Marshfield as from Springfield. The circumstances and conditions applying from the points involved on the traffic in question are not substantially dissimilar. The investigation covered freight articles generally, but the testimony was confined to live poultry. Held (1), That the respondent has failed to justify such higher rate from Marshfield than from Springfield and other more westerly stations for the carriage of live poultry to Chicago, and that by keeping such higher rate in force it is acting in violation of the fourth and third sections of the act. (2), That the respondent should not insist upon making higher charges to Chicago from Marshfield than from more distant points of shipment upon other kinds of traffic, unless it is prepared to justify such action by showing an essentially different state of facts than appears in this proceeding.

CHICAGO FIRE PROOF COVERING COMPANY

v.

CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY AND  
THE PENNSYLVANIA COMPANY.

Decided November 1, 1899.

*First.*—The provision in section 3 of the act, that "this shall not be construed as requiring any such common carrier to give the use of its tracks or terminal facilities to another carrier engaged in like business," refers to facilities for interchanging traffic between connecting lines; and providing such facilities is not involved in this proceeding.

} *Greater charge for shorter haul,  
undue preference.*

*Second.*—The varying cost to shippers in delivering freight to the carrier for shipment can have no bearing in a case which has sole reference to what are unlawful rates from the carriers' stations.

*Third.*—Upon complaint that defendants charge unlawful rates on asbestos articles from Summerdale, Ill., to Lima, Ohio, and other eastern points, it appears that Summerdale, although within the city limits of Chicago, is a station on the Chicago & North-Western railway, which for purposes of shipment and carriage is independent of the main depots of that company in Chicago; that it is a shorter-distance point, and Milwaukee and other places on the Milwaukee division of the Chicago & North-Western north of Summerdale are longer-distance points, over defendants' established through line with reference to L. C. L. shipments to eastern destinations; that defendants have through rates in effect from stations north of Chicago, but on traffic from Summerdale the Pennsylvania Company insists upon a higher charge made by adding rates to and from the point of connection in Chicago; that these through rates were not denied to Summerdale before it became part of Chicago by extension of the city limits; and that the circumstances and conditions governing the transportation are not dissimilar. Held, that defendants' higher less than carload rates of asbestos articles from Summerdale than from points north of Chicago to and including Milwaukee, on shipments destined to Lima, Ohio, and other eastern points, are in violation of sections 3 and 4 of the statute.

*Fourth.*—Defendants offer to carry asbestos material at established through joint rates to eastern points from stations north of Chicago, including Milwaukee; and by denying such rates on like shipments from Summerdale, an intermediate station, and exacting higher rates thereon, they subject complainant to undue prejudice in its competition with other dealers for the sale of asbestos articles and shipment thereof to eastern localities.

*Fifth.*—Notwithstanding the contention that higher rates are lawfully in force on shipments from Summerdale than from Milwaukee and other more distant points to eastern localities, it appears that, under the tariffs in force over defendants' through line, the rates from Summerdale were actually the same as those from more distant stations, including Milwaukee, at the time a less than carload lot of asbestos pipe coverings was shipped by complainant from Summerdale to Lima, Ohio. Held, that in failing to apply the through Milwaukee-division rates from Summerdale on such shipment the defendants acted contrary to the requirements of section 6 of the act, and that complainant is entitled to recover the overcharge.

*Sixth.*—Apparently the rates on carload shipments to the east from Summerdale should be as low as those in force to the same destination from Milwaukee, but as carload lots take somewhat different routing than less than carloads from Summerdale, and the evidence as to carloads was not specific, no opinion on that branch of the case is expressed, and complainant is granted leave to apply for further hearing.



---

---

DIGEST OF DECISIONS OF SUPREME COURT

---

---



## DIGEST OF DECISIONS

### OF THE SUPREME COURT REFERRING TO MATTERS AFFECTING RAILROADS.

#### PERSONAL INJURY—INJURY TO FIREMAN—NEGLIGENCE—BURDEN OF PROOF—EXPERT TESTIMONY—ASSUMPTION OF RISK.

In an action by a servant to recover for personal injuries, the burden is on the servant to prove the negligence which was the proximate cause of his injury.

*Res ipsa loquitur* does not apply to injuries received by a locomotive fireman riding on an engine which was derailed because of a broken axle.

In an action by a locomotive fireman to recover for injuries received through the derailing of his engine, which had a broken axle, expert testimony whether a broken axle might derail an engine is admissible.

Expert testimony whether certain peculiar and unusual actions of the engine, to which the engineer's attention had been called before the accident, indicated a broken axle is likewise admissible.

The question whether the derailment of a train was due to a broken axle of the engine is for the jury.

The question whether a locomotive fireman was justified in remaining on the engine because the engineer, after having his attention called to certain peculiar and unusual actions of the engine in running over the track, continued on his run without giving the matter any serious attention is for the jury.

The question whether a locomotive fireman, in the exercise of ordinary care, should have appreciated the peril of remaining on the engine after it began to act in a strange and unusual manner in running on the track, the cause of which was unknown to him, is for the jury. *Brownfield v. Chicago, R. I. & P. R'y Co.*, 77 N. W. Rep., 1038.

#### PERSONAL INJURY—SETTLEMENT—FRAUD—EVIDENCE.

After commencement of a suit for personal injuries against a railway company, plaintiff and his mother went to town where defendant's attorney was, called on him and, without the knowledge of their attorney, made a settlement. Held, That such settlement was made without reliance on an opinion as to the merits of plaintiff's cause of action expressed by defendant's attorney.

A representation that a railroad company could show by five or six witnesses that plaintiff had not been pushed from a car by the company's brakeman, made to induce the compromise of a suit against the railroad company for injuries received through such alleged pushing off, is not false where plaintiff testifies that he and two others got on the train, and other people got on it at the same time, and that there were other parties on the car in front of him, since the representation is not that the witnesses are eyewitnesses.

A settlement of an action by plaintiff with defendant's attorney direct is not fraudulent because defendant's attorney stated that it could be made in the absence of plaintiff's attorney, where plaintiff and his mother were the moving parties and went to the town where the attorney was located in order to procure it.

Under a reply to a plea of compromise and settlement, that it was procured by defendant fraudulently representing to plaintiff that he had no cause of action, and that the defendant could show that the facts were not as plaintiff claimed them to be, evidence that one of the



representations made to induce the settlement was a statement by defendant's attorney that plaintiff's attorney had offered to settle the suit for a certain sum is inadmissible. *Johnson v. Chicago, R. I. & P. Ry. Co.*, 77 N. W. Rep., 476.

**PERSONAL INJURY—DEATH BY WRONGFUL ACT—PROXIMATE CAUSE—RAILROAD CROSSING—OBSTRUCTIONS—DUTY TO CHECK SPEED—FLAGMAN—NEGLECT—FAILURE TO BLOW WHISTLE OR RING BELL—QUESTION FOR JURY—INSTRUCTIONS—FAILURE TO CHARGE—SPECIAL FINDINGS—EVIDENCE—SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES—DIVISION—PREJUDICIAL ERROR.**

The fact that another cause operated with the negligence of defendant to produce the injuries complained of will not relieve him from liability, if his negligence, concurring with such other cause, was the proximate cause of the injury.

In an action for injuries received at a railroad crossing, it appeared that the decedent's team became frightened and unmanageable by steam escaping from a mill. The court charged that, if defendant company was negligent in failing to ring the bell or blow the whistle of its approaching train, still, if, by reason of the team becoming unmanageable, the giving of the signals would not have prevented the injury, then it could not be said to have been caused by such failure. Held, a sufficient charge of the effect of the conduct of the team on the question of the proximate cause of the injury.

Where it appeared that the team driven by decedent on approaching a railroad crossing became frightened and unmanageable, the question whether defendant was negligent in sounding the whistle when near the crossing, thereby increasing the fright of the team, was properly left to the jury.

A charge that if the surroundings of a crossing were such that, with the signals given, and the speed of the train, persons at or near the crossing, using ordinary care, had reasonable warning of the approach of the train, then defendant was under no obligation to check the speed as it approached the crossing, was correct.

Where the undisputed evidence showed that a view of the track was partially obstructed, it was not error for the court to assume in its charge that there were obstructions to sight and hearing of an approaching train.

In an action for injuries at a railroad crossing, where the evidence showed that decedent's team was unmanageable, a charge on the question of defendant's negligence in not providing a flagman at the crossing was not error.

Under code section 2072, requiring that a locomotive whistle be sounded sixty rods before a crossing is reached, except in cities or towns unless required by an ordinance thereof, failure of the court, in an action for injuries at a crossing within the limits of a town having no such ordinance, to charge that it was defendant's duty to sound the whistle, was not error.

In an action for injuries at a crossing, there was evidence that the view of the track was obstructed by a corncrib, and then by a section house. Held, that a special finding that if decedent, while approaching the track had looked, he would not have been able to have seen the train from the time he passed the corncrib until he reached the crossing, was not in conflict with the evidence.

In an action for injuries at a crossing, the court requested special findings as to whether the attention of the deceased was so divided by the fright of the team, the danger arising therefrom, and his efforts to control them, that, under the circumstances, he was not guilty of negligence in not stopping and listening before going on the crossing, and whether his attention was so diverted that he was not guilty of negligence in not knowing the approach of the train. Held, that the findings requested called for important facts bearing on the question of contributory negligence, and were not error.

Division of a request interrogatory into two, containing every material fact in the one requested, is not prejudicial error. *Pratt v. Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company*, 77 N. W. Rep. 1095.

**NEGLECT—DAMAGE—MISCONDUCT OF JURY—DISCRETION.**

In an action for the negligent killing of plaintiff's horse because of an insufficient fence along defendant's right of way, which was blown down, as plaintiff claimed, by an ordinary wind, a new trial was granted after judgment for defendant, for misconduct of the jury, in that one of them, who had been employed by defendant, stated to the jury while deliberating

that he had helped to build the fence, and that it was strong and well built; that another juror stated that the storm was a cyclone, and that his field of flax, which was some distance from the main track of the storm, was so badly injured that out of 835 acres he only threshed 260 bushels of grain; and that another stated that, on the night of the cyclone, the wind blew so hard that it made the dishes and windows in the house rattle. Held, that the granting of a new trial was not an abuse of discretion. *Bohn v. Chicago & N.-W. Ry. Co.*, 78 N. W. Rep., 200.

**PERSONAL INJURY—MASTER AND SERVANT—CAUSE OF ACTION—ASSUMPTION OF RISK.**

A complaint by a brakeman against a railroad company for injuries received while coupling cars, alleging negligence in using different systems of bumpers in the coupling of its trains, instead of the ordinary improved bumper, cannot be amended after the running of limitations by charging negligence in having the bumpers loose and out of repair, since stating a new cause of action.

In an action to recover damages for negligence, "the cause of action," as used in pleadings, is not the injury wrongfully inflicted through defendant's negligence, but is the fact or facts that justify the action, or show the right to maintain it.

An employee who knows of improper appliances used in his work, but does not object, assumes the risk. *Box v. Chicago, R. I. & P. Ry. Co.*, 78 N. W. Rep., 694.

**PERSONAL INJURY—INJURIES TO PASSENGERS—CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE—INSTRUCTIONS—PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE.**

An instruction that, in order to recover for injuries, a passenger must have been free from any fault or negligence contributing to produce the injury, is erroneous, as holding him to the exercise of extraordinary care, and preventing a recovery though the negligence was slight, and did amount to a want of ordinary care.

Plaintiff need not prove his case to the satisfaction of the jury, but merely by a preponderance of evidence. *Jeroliman v. Chicago G. W. Ry. Co.*, 78 N. W. Rep., 855.

**PERSONAL INJURY—MASTER AND SERVANT—ACCIDENTS—FELLOW SERVANTS—SCOPE OF EMPLOYMENT.**

Where an employee of a railroad company, riding on a handcar, strikes at another who, in an attempt to avoid the blow, pushes off a third employee, who is run over, the injury is not a willful one.

Under code 1873, section 1307, making railroad companies liable for injuries to employees, resulting from neglect of other employees, or from their willful wrongs, when connected with the operation of the road, when an employee riding on a handcar struck at another, who, in an attempt to avoid the blow, pushed off a third employee, who was injured, the company is not liable, though the injured employee was operating a car, since the employee striking the blow was not acting within the scope of his authority. *Knicade v. Chicago, M. & St. P. Ry. Co.*, 78 N. W. Rep., 698.

**PERSONAL INJURY—ACCIDENT AT CROSSING—NEGLECT.**

A railroad company permitted the smoke of burning slack to obscure the track at a crossing, but there was no evidence that this contributed to an accident. There were cattle guards and snow fences along the right of way, but they were properly constructed and located.

Plaintiff and two others did not hear the crossing whistle, but the engineer and two others on the engine with him swore positively that the whistle was sounded at the distance required by law (sixty rods), and the bell was set ringing. Four others testified to hearing the crossing whistle. Held, that negligence was not shown, and this though the high rate of speed required the whistle to be sounded more than sixty rods from the crossing, since plaintiff, not having heard the signal that was given, would not have heard it had it been given sooner.



Plaintiff was driving an empty wagon, and had his head closely bundled up, and testified he listened, but heard no noise of the engine. He stopped 200 yards from the crossing, and again at the edge of the right of way, and looked, and saw nothing coming. When he last looked the snow fence obscured the track, but had he looked after advancing a few feet he could have seen the track for three-fourths of a mile. From the time he first looked till he reached the track the engine had time to travel from a point of vision to the crossing. The engineer and the superintendent on the engine testified plaintiff looked over his shoulder, turned around, and hurried up his horses; that he was fifty feet from the crossing, and still had time to avoid being struck, that they whistled again; and the engineer testified that he then applied the air. Plaintiff was familiar with the crossing and knew no train was scheduled to pass, this engine being an extra.

Held, that plaintiff was guilty of contributory negligence. *Payne v. Chicago & North-Western Railway Company*, 78 N. W. Rep. 813.

#### PERSONAL INJURY—MASTER AND SERVANT—INJURY IN OPERATION OF RAILROAD.

An injury received by a brakeman, while assisting in coaling an engine, through the negligence of a co-employee in operating the hoisting crane so as to knock him from the platform—such movement of the crane not being necessary in order to permit the train to start—is not an injury "in any manner connected with use and operation of any railroad," within the meaning of code 1873, section 1307. *Reddington v. Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company*, 78 N. W. Rep. 800.

#### PERSONAL INJURY—TRESPASSERS—GROSS NEGLIGENCE.

Deceased was in a caboose, without business there or intention of becoming a passenger. The caboose was struck by an incoming train, under circumstances justifying a finding of negligence by the engineer, but neither he or any employee of the railroad knew deceased was in the car. Held, that, since deceased was a trespasser, and the railroad owed him no duty until it discovered him, it was not liable for causing his death.

The fact that the conduct of the employees of a railroad is "unusual and reckless" does not constitute gross negligence. *Earl v. Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company*, 79 N. W. Rep. 381.

#### PERSONAL INJURY—CARRIER OF PASSENGERS—ACTION FOR NEGLIGENCE—ISSUE OF GROSS NEGLIGENCE—SPECIAL EXCURSION TRAIN—PASSENGER—PRESUMPTION—EVIDENCE.

On a petition alleging only an injury to a passenger because of a carrier's negligence, it is error to submit to the jury the question of plaintiff's right to recover, as a trespasser, for gross negligence.

One who boarded a train knowing that it was run for a particular class of excursionists, and that it did not stop at regular stations, and which was not left at a place where an invitation to all persons to take passage therein could be implied, will be presumed to have been a passenger thereon.

Evidence that plaintiff, on inquiring and learning of the conductor of a train, intended for a particular class of excursionists only, when it stopped said that it would do for him; that he boarded it in the conductor's presence; that he intended to pay his fare, and had the money therefor; and that others not excursionists had been allowed to board the train—tends to show that plaintiff was accepted as a passenger, and justifies the submission of that question to the jury.

The acceptance, as a passenger, by the conductor of a special excursion train, of one not belonging to the excursion, is binding on the company, and he will be treated as a passenger, if he did not know that the conductor exceeded his authority. *Robinson, C. J., and Waterman, J., dissenting. Fitzgibbon v. Chicago & North-Western Railway Company*, 79 N. W. Rep. 477.

#### PERSONAL INJURY—MASTER AND SERVANT—NEGLECT—ASSUMPTION OF RISK—UNSAFE IMPLEMENTS—EVIDENCE.

In an action for negligence, where plaintiff alleged that the tools furnished decedent by the defendant were unsafe, it was error to refuse to allow her to prove what were the proper and ordinary implements for the work in which decedent was engaged.

The testimony of the men who were familiar with the kind of work in which decedent was engaged was competent to show what implements were commonly used for such work.

Where decedent performed work to which he was unaccustomed, and which could not be said, as a matter of law, to require no more than ordinary skill, it cannot be assumed that he knew the implements furnished him were inferior, and the work dangerous, and waived his right to any damage for injury.

If, in an action for negligence, plaintiff can show that a certain implement was proper and generally used for the kind of work in which decedent was engaged, and that such implement was not furnished to decedent, then the question of negligence of both parties should be submitted to the jury. *Anderson v. Illinois Central Railway Company*, 80 N. W. Rep. 561.

#### DISCRIMINATION—JOINT RATES, ETC.—UNJUST AND DISCRIMINATORY CHARGES—JOINT RATES—ACTION TO RECOVER PENALTY—DISCOVERY—INTERROGATORIES ATTACHED TO PETITION—INTEREST.

Under acts 1890, chapter 17, section 1, which is constitutional, railroad companies may voluntarily establish joint rates between the different stations on their respective lines, while section 5 prohibits any unjust and unreasonable charge. A petition to recover the penalty provided in such act, which alleges that defendant railroad companies established joint rates between all stations on their respective lines in the state, and they unjustly discriminated between the different points on their lines, to plaintiff's damage, and that the rates charged plaintiff were unjust and unreasonable, states a cause of action; and that it contains further allegations showing the different rates charged between different points does not make the action one based solely on the fact of such differences as establishing the unjust or discriminatory character of the rates charged.

When two railroad companies voluntarily enter into an agreement for joint rates, which covers all stations on their lines in the state, they virtually create a new and independent line, and become subject to the law preventing unjust discrimination and unreasonable exaction.

Where a petition alleges that joint rates were established by two railroad companies for all stations on their lines, the rates charged for the same class of goods over like distances of road may be considered, not only in arriving at the solution of the question of unjust discrimination, but also in determining whether a rate charged was unreasonable; and an allegation that a lower rate was charged for transporting like goods over the same distance of road than was charged plaintiff makes a *prima facie* case of unjust discrimination.

Prior to the adoption of the code of 1897 (which expressly provides therefor) a corporation like an individual defendant could be required to answer interrogatories attached to a petition.

Where interrogatories attached to a petition to be answered by a corporation defendant were answered by an officer of the defendant by stating that he had no personal knowledge of the matters inquired about and knew of no other officer who had such knowledge, and the facts were such as could be readily ascertained from the records and books of the corporation, such answers were properly stricken out as uncandid, and an attempt to avoid a compliance with the law.

Where an amendment to a petition is permitted to be filed by the court, the plaintiff may attach interrogatories thereto.

Interest is not recoverable on the treble damages imposed by the statute as a penalty for unjust discrimination in charges by a railroad company. *Ladd J., and Deemer, J., dissenting. Blair v. Sioux City & Pacific Railway Company, et al. Hollaway v. Same. Browa v. Same. Macey v. Same*, 80 N. W. Rep. 673.

#### PERSONAL INJURY—ACCIDENT AT CROSSING—PRESUMPTION OF DUE CARE—EVIDENCE—BURDEN OF PROOF—CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE.

The presumption that one who lost his life in driving over a railroad crossing in front of an approaching train exercised due care is not conclusive.

In an action against a railroad company for the loss of plaintiff's horse, wagon and harness, by a collision in which plaintiff's servant was killed at a crossing by a train, the burden is on plaintiff to show, not only negligence on the part of defendant, but freedom from contributory negligence on the part of his servant.

Plaintiff's servant drove over a railroad crossing, and was killed by a train, which he could have discovered if he had looked and listened any time after he was within 125 to fifty



feet of the track, in time to have avoided the accident. He knew the crossing, and his eyesight and hearing was good. Held, that his negligence was clearly apparent. *Crawford v. Chicago Great Western Railway Company*, 80 N. W. Rep. 519.

STREET CROSSING—RIGHT OF WAY—PLAT DEDICATION—CONVEYANCE—STREET CROSSING—NON-USER—LIMITATIONS OF ACTIONS—CITY ORDINANCE—SIGNING BY MAYOR—ESTOPPEL.

The owner of land agreed to give a projected railroad a right of way across it, and before the road was laid, platted the land, showing streets and the right of way; the streets being continuous except where crossed by the right of way, and the right of way not being crossed by the streets. Thereafter the owner executed to the company deeds which conveyed lands reserved for depot grounds, and described them by metes and bounds, and then described the right of way as a strip of land running through the platted land and through and across the streets. The railroad company planked the street crossing in controversy, and it was so used for many years; and when other streets were opened they too were planked by the company, and have been used ever since. Held, that the filing of the plat did not amount to a conveyance of a right of way to the company, and that the company's title rested on the deed, and that it reserved the street crossing shown in the plat, which at least constituted a common law dedication of the street across the right of way.

Where a railroad recognized and adopted a dedication of streets which crossed its right of way as shown by a plat, and planked the crossing and maintained it for years, mere non-user by the public will not defeat the city's right to open and replank the crossing after the company has destroyed it.

The statute of limitation will not run to defeat the right of a city in the exercise of its governmental powers, to open and use a disused crossing over a railroad right of way.

The passage by the city council of an ordinance vacating a street crossing over a railroad which was not signed by the mayor, and was therefore ineffective, and which was thereafter reconsidered and "laid on the table," does not, after the lapse of several years, during which the crossing was not used, estop the city to reopening the crossing.

Failure of a mayor of a city to sign an ordinance passed by the council, as required by acts of Twentieth General Assembly, chapter 192, renders it of no effect. *Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company v. City of Council Bluffs et al.*, 80 N. W. Rep. 554.

PERSONAL INJURY—INJURIES TO TRESPASSERS.

A railroad company is liable for the death of a trespasser on one of its bridges, who was run over by a train, where the engineer could have stopped it in time to avoid the accident, had the fireman, after he discovered the trespasser on the bridge, promptly notified the engineer of the danger.

The fact that the trespasser might have jumped to the ground, a distance of over eight feet, or that he might have laid down on the ties, does not relieve the railroad company from liability if its employes neglected to exercise reasonable care to avoid the collision after they discovered him on the bridge. *Purell v. Chicago & North-Western Railway Company*, 80 N. W. Rep. 682.

PERSONAL INJURY—NEGLIGENCE OF FELLOW SERVANT—STATUTORY OF LIABILITY OF MASTER.

A section hand, who is injured in a collision between the hand car on which he is riding and another hand car, is within the protection of code, section 2071, which renders railroad companies liable to injuries to their employes caused by the negligence of co-employees connected with the use of the operation of the railway. *Smith v. Chicago Great Western Railway Company*, 80 N. W. Rep. 638.

DELAY IN SHIPMENT—FREIGHT CONTRACTS.

It being within the apparent power of the agent to contract for delivery of a car at a certain place within a specified time, his contract therefore is binding on the company, the shipper not knowing of the limitations of his power.

Where there is a verbal agreement of carriage, under which the shipper accepts and loads the car, it cannot be varied or modified by a receipt which the carrier's agent thereafter delivered to the shipper, folded up, and which the shipper, without knowledge of its contents, puts in his pocket.

A carrier is not liable for a breach of its contract to deliver a car at a certain place at a specified time, the delay being caused by the shipper's failure to comply with the requirements of the contract that the car be loaded in time to be sent out on a certain day. *Stouer v. Chicago Great Western Railway Company*, 80 N. W. Rep. 569.



# INDEX TO THIS VOLUME.

SEE TOPICAL INDEX FOR INDEX TO ALL VOLUMES—1878 TO 1899  
INCLUSIVE.

	PAGE
<b>A</b> BANDONMENT OF ROAD, Adams, W., Fairfield, v. C., B. & Q., condemning new line.	85
ABBOTT, J. Leverton of, v. Iowa Cent., refusal to allow loading cars from wagons	92
ABBOTT, J. Leverton of, v. Iowa Cent., condition of stock yards	99
ACCIDENTS TO PERSONS IN IOWA	207
Comparative tables	13, 14
To employes coupling cars and falling from trains, comparative table	13
ADAMS, J. H., Havelock, v. C. & N.-W., site for elevator, jurisdiction of commission	107
ADAMS, WALTER, Fairfield, v. C., B. & Q., abandonment of road	85
ADDITIONAL DEPOT GROUNDS—see <i>Depot Grounds</i> .	
ADJUSTMENT OF CASES	47
AGENT, petitions for—see <i>Station Facilities</i> .	
AIR BRAKES ON FREIGHT CARS	12
Comparative table of	13
AIR BRAKES, number of on cars	188, 189
AKRON MILLING CO., Akron, v. C., M. & St. P., scarcity of cars	122
ALBIA, W. A. Gray of, v. Iowa Cent., private crossing at grade	69
ALBIA & CENTERVILLE RAILWAY—	
Officers, directors and mileage	241
ALGONA, additional depot grounds at, petition of Iowa Cent. & Western	44
ALLISON, D. B. Downey of, v. C. G. W. R'y, right of shipper to choose market	123
AMES & COLLEGE RAILWAY CO.—	
Officers, directors and mileage	211
ANITA, William Weston of, v. C., R. I. & P., scarcity of cars	118
APLINGTON, E. L. Blackmore et al, v. Ill. Cent., stopping through train	38
APPROPRIATING LAND FOR SNOW FENCE—	
Harrington, F. E., Marathon, v. C., M. & St. P.	92
ARION, grade railroad crossing at, Ft. D. & O. R'y (Ill. Cent.) v. C., M. & St. P.	102
ASHTON, elevator site at, E. J. Edmonds, Marcus, v. C., St. P., M. & O.	74
ASSETS AND LIABILITIES, current	176, 177
ATCHISON, TOPEKA & SANTA FE RAILWAY—	
Officers, directors and mileage	211
AUTOMATIC COUPLERS—see <i>Couplers, Automatic</i> .	
<b>B</b> EACONSFIELD, T. B. Jones of, v. C., B. & Q. and H. & S., overcharge	111
BECK, W. J. R., Ft. Madison, v. St. L., K. & N. W., train service insufficient	79
BEEMAN, O. D., Waukon, v. C., M. & St. P., excess rate on hard coal	109
BEST, W. J., Villisca, v. C., B. & Q., excess rate—Interstate	72
BLACKMORE, E. L. et al, Aplington, v. Ill. Cent. Rd. Co., stopping through train	38
BONAPARTE, John Cresswell of, v. C., Ft. M. & D. M., overcharge	125
BONDS, tables of	131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139
BONDS OWNED	138
BOYD, citizens of, v. C. G. W., petition for depot	84
BRAKES, AIR—see <i>Air Brakes</i> .	
BREDA, Bruning Bros. of, v. C. & N.-W., scarcity of cars	68
BRIDGES, number of	186
BROWNE, J. V. H., Flagler, v. C., B. & Q. et al, damage in transit	95



	PAGE
BROWN, W. S., Manson, v. Ill. Cent. Rd., demurrage charges.....	120
BRUNING BROS., Breda, v. C. & N.-W., scarcity of cars.....	66
BUENA VISTA COUNTY, supervisors of, v. C. & N.-W., highway crossing at grade.....	61
BURLINGTON & NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	250
Pierce & Glass, Winfield, v., delay in shipment of tile.....	90
BURLINGTON & WESTERN RAILWAY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	251
BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS & NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	215
Douglas, J. H., West Branch, v., removal of coal shed.....	96
Foster, T. M., North English, v., overcharge.....	68
Farmers' Co-operative Association, Vern S. Ellis, secretary, Swea City, v., site for elevator.....	80
Hummer, George, Mercantile Company, Iowa City, v., excessive rates (interstate).....	97
Niver Iron Works Company, Muscatine, v., refusal to switch.....	82
Rasmussen, A. D., et al., Pioneer Hay Camp, v., shipping privileges at Pioneer Hay Camp.....	29
River Junction, citizens of, v., petition for telegraph operator.....	38
Smith, E. F., Wellman, v., sending cars off own line.....	112
Smith, R. H., et al., by G. C. Hoover, attorney, West Branch, and Board of Supervisors, Cedar county, v., dangerous highway crossing.....	52
<b>CAPACITY OF CARS, marked, loading to limit—</b>	
Dubois & Slife v. C. M. & St. P.....	124
<b>CAPITAL STOCK, tables of.....</b>	130, 130, 137
CARMAN, GEORGE L., superintendent Western Railway Weighing Association and Inspection Bureau, concerning the use of "shrinker" on scales.....	72
CARS, all kinds, number of.....	188, 189
Comparative table of, 1878 to 1899.....	13
<b>CAR FAMINE.....</b>	10
<b>CAR MILEAGE, credit balance—see Earnings.</b>	
CARS, mileage of.....	193, 197
Number of in train, loaded and unloaded.....	193, 197
Scarcity of.....	10
<b>CASES CLOSED BY CORRESPONDENCE.....</b>	47
<b>CATTLE GUARDS, number of in Iowa.....</b>	195
<b>CATTLE PASS—see Crossing, Farm.</b>	
CEDAR COUNTY, supervisors of, v. B. C. R. & N., dangerous highway crossing.....	52
CEDAR RAPIDS, J. C. Pickering of, inquiry concerning demurrage charges.....	114
CEDAR RAPIDS, GARNER & NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	216
Hill & Hall, Wesley, v., opening street in Tiltonka.....	110
CEDAR RAPIDS, township trustees of, v. C. M. & St. P., dangerous highway crossing.....	93
CHEROKEE, D. W. Townsend of, v. Ill. Cent., estimated weight of brick.....	84
CHESTER, E. Fairchild of, v. C. M. & St. P., overcharge.....	106
CHICAGO & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	232
Adams, J. H., Havelock, v., site for elevator—jurisdiction of board.....	107
Bruning Bros., Breda, v., scarcity of cars.....	66
Gaston, H. F., Traer, v., undergrade farm crossing.....	116
Gravatt, O., Traer, v., farm crossing, undergrade.....	113
Lookwood, L. N., Coldwater, v., under crossing.....	104
Norellins, A., Kiron, v., location of station.....	100
Pearson & Hayton, Pierson, v., overcharge (interstate).....	95
Relchers, J. C., Point Lookout, Utah, v., damage by fire from locomotive.....	73
Southall & Sons, William, Irwin and Pierson, v., scarcity of cars.....	63
White, George C., Nevada, v., scarcity of cars; right of shipper to load cars from wagon.....	121

	PAGE
CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	217
Adams, Walter, Fairfield, v., abandonment of road.....	85
Best, W. J., Villisca, v., excess rates (interstate).....	72
Browne, J. V. H., Flagler, v., mirror broken in transit (interstate).....	95
Jones, T. B., Beaconsfield, v., overcharge—two minimums.....	111
Mt. Pleasant Milling company, Mt. Pleasant, v., minimum weight of flour in sacks too high.....	98
Oline Brs., Page Center, v., petition for agent.....	49
White, W. Q., et al., Ellston, v., application of class "A" freight rates to the Hameston & Shenandoah Railroad company.....	103
CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & KANSAS CITY RAILWAY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	230
CHICAGO, FT. MADISON & DES MOINES RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	233
Cresswell, John, Bonaparte, v., overcharge (interstate).....	125
CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	225
Downey, D. B., Allison, v., right of shipper to choose market.....	123
Garrett, Jesse A., Orilla, v., station facilities.....	60
Karnatz, Kohann, et al., Boyd, v., petition for depot.....	84
Lynch, P., New Hampton, v., drainage, under crossing.....	89
Oelwein, city of, v., improper construction of viaduct.....	81
CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	227
Akron Milling company, Akron, v., scarcity of cars.....	122
Beeman, H., Waukon, v., excess rates on hard coal (interstate).....	109
Conger, James, Des Moines, v., train service.....	118
Davenport, city of, v., viaduct.....	71
Dubuque & Sioux City Railway company and the Illinois Central Railroad company v., grade crossing at Storm Lake.....	101
Du Bois, Rockwell City, and M. Slife, Dedham, v., loading cars to marked capacity.....	124
Fairchild, E., Ohester, v., overcharge (interstate).....	106
Ft. Dodge & Omaha Railroad company (Illinois Central Railroad company) v., grade crossing at Arion.....	103
George, W. C., Collins, v., undergrade farm crossing for cattle.....	88
Harrington, F. E., Marathon, v., appropriating land for snow fences.....	92
Lyons, Patrick, Navan, v., undergrade farm crossing.....	64
Marron, J. P., Jackson Junction, v., wrongful ejectment from train.....	57
Nemmers, N. B., Lamotte, v., side track to elevator.....	114
Patterson, A. L., Owego, v., scarcity of cars.....	114
Reeves, Henry, Decorah, v., excessive charge (interstate).....	108
Riley, John W., Defiance, v., scarcity of cars.....	124
Schnepp, M., East Elkport, v., delay in handling freight.....	73
Smith, L., Elwell, v., site for elevator.....	117
Simmons, Charles H., Mapleton, v., drainage.....	83
Township trustees, Cedar Rapids, by J. G. Graves, clerk, v., dangerous highway crossing.....	98
CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	230
Conroy, P. T., Walnut, v., overcharge on shipment of stock cattle.....	97
Cruze, J. B., Vincennes, v., farm crossing; renewal of bridge in private crossing.....	62
Frum, S. B., Shelby, v., application for coalhouse site.....	52
Haynes, Walter E., attorney, William Weston, Anita, v., scarcity of cars.....	118
Johnson Bros., Rippey, v., scarcity of cars.....	113
Keokuk & Western Railway company, v., refusal to switch.....	76
Schafnit, G. F., Moscow, v., refusal to furnish cars for ear corn.....	77
Township trustees, Walnut, v., highway overhead crossing.....	54
CHICAGO, ST. PAUL, MINNEAPOLIS & OMAHA RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Edmonds, E. J., Marcus, v., elevator site at Ashton.....	74
CHOICE OF MARKET THE SHIPPER'S RIGHT. Downey, D. B., Allison, v. C. G. W. Ry.....	123



	PAGE
CHURDAN, W. Dudley of, v. D. M., N. & W., discrimination in freight rates .....	53
COALHOUSE SITE—see <i>Sites</i> .	
COAL OUTPUT IN IOWA BY YEARS .....	29
COAL RATES IN IOWA—decision of commissioners .....	19
Investigation ordered by general assembly .....	9
COLDWATER, L. N. Lockwood of, v. I. M. & N.-W. (C. & N.-W.), undergrade farm crossing .....	104
COLLINS, W. C. George of, v. C. M. & St. P., undergrade cattle pass .....	88
COMMISSIONERS' ANNUAL CONVENTION .....	14
COMPILED RETURNS OF RAILROAD COMPANIES .....	127
COMPLAINTS, adjustment of without formal orders .....	6
CONDITION OF STOCK YARDS—see <i>Stock Yards</i> .	
CONGER, JAMES, Des Moines, v. C. M. & St. P., train service .....	113
CONNECTIONS OF TRAINS AT JUNCTION POINTS—	
Waterloo, junction of Ill. Cent. and C. G. W. railways .....	75
CONROY, P. T., Walnut, v. C. R. I. & P., overcharge on stock cattle .....	97
CONSTRUCTION, cost of .....	142
CONVENTION OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS .....	14
COST OF ROAD AND EQUIPMENT .....	142
COUPLERS, automatic, number of .....	188, 189
Discussion of .....	12
Comparative table of for twenty two years .....	13
COURT, supreme, digest of decisions of .....	267
CRESSWELL, JOHN, Bonaparte, v. C. Ft. M. & D. M., overcharge .....	125
CROOKED CREEK RAILROAD CO.—	
Officers, directors and mileage .....	236
CROSSINGS, FARM, number of .....	186
CROSSING, FARM, complaints concerning—	
Cruze, J. B., Vincennes, v. C. R. I. & P., renewal of bridge .....	62
Gaston, H. F., Traer, v. I. M. & N.-W. (C. & N.-W.), undergrade .....	116
George, W. C., Collins, v. C. M. & St. P., cattle pass under track .....	88
Gravatt, O., Traer, v. I. M. & N.-W. (C. & N.-W.), undergrade .....	113
Gray, W. A., Albia, v. Iowa Cent., at grade .....	69
Lockwood, L. N., Coldwater, v. I. M. & N.-W. (C. & N.-W.), undergrade .....	104
Lynch, P., New Hampton, v. C. G. W., improper construction .....	90
Lyons, P., Navas, v. C. M. & St. P., undergrade farm crossing .....	64
Walter, H. F., Rockwell City, v. Ft. D. & O., undergrade .....	91
CROSSINGS, HIGHWAY, number of .....	186
CROSSINGS, HIGHWAY AND FARM, discussed .....	7
Legislation recommended .....	7
CROSSING, HIGHWAY, complaints concerning—	
Buena Vista county supervisors v. C. & N.-W., refusal to open .....	61
Cedar Rapids, township trustees of, v. C. M. & St. P., dangerous .....	93
Hill & Hall, Wesley, v. C. R., G. & N. W., opening street in Titonka .....	110
Supervisors Cedar county et al., v. B. C. R. & N., dangerous .....	52
Walnut, township trustees of, v. C. R. I. & P., overhead .....	54
CROSSINGS, RAILROAD, number of .....	186
CROSSINGS, RAILROADS crossing each other at grade, should it be permitted—discussion .....	11
CROSSING, RAILWAY—	
D. & S. C. Rd. Co. (Ill. Cent.) v. C. M. & St. P., at grade, Storm Lake .....	101
Ft. D. & O. Ry. (Ill. Cent.) v. C. M. & St. P., at grade, Arion .....	102
CROSSING, STREET—see <i>Crossing, Highway</i> .	
CRUZE, J. B., Vincennes, v. C. R. I. & P. Ry. Co., private farm crossing .....	62
<b>D</b> AMAGE BY FIRE FROM ENGINES—see <i>Fire Set Out by Engines</i> .	
DAMAGE FROM DELAY IN SHIPMENT—see <i>Delays</i> .	
DAMAGE TO GOODS IN TRANSIT—	
Browne, J. V. H., Flagler, v. C. B. & Q., mirror broken .....	95
DAINGEROUS HIGHWAY CROSSINGS—see <i>Crossings, Highway</i> .	
DAVENPORT, city of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for viaduct .....	71
DAWSON, E. A., made chairman of national committee on delays attendant in enforcing orders of commissioners in state courts .....	15
DE BUSK, M. R., Wiota, in matter of mail service .....	94

	PAGE
DEBT PER MILE .....	187
DEBT, funded, tables of .....	131-139
DEBT REPRESENTING ROAD IN IOWA .....	137
DECISIONS OF COMMISSIONERS .....	16
DECISIONS OF SUPREME COURT, digest of .....	267
DECISIONS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, digest of .....	255
DECOHAN, Henry Reeves of, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive freight charges .....	108
DEHAM, M. Slife of, v. C. M. & St. P., loading cars to marked capacity .....	124
DEFIANCE, John W. Riley of, v. C. M. & St. P., scarcity of cars .....	124
DELAY, complaints concerning—	
Pierce & Glass, Winfield, v. B. & N. W., in shipment of tile .....	90
Schnepf, M. E. Elkport, v. C. M. & St. P., in handling freight .....	73
DEMURRAGE CHARGES, inquiry of J. C. Pickering, of Cedar Rapids, concerning .....	114
DEMURRAGE CHARGE, complaint concerning—	
Brown, W. S., Manson, v. Ill. Cent., right of company to demand .....	120
DEPOTS, petition for—see <i>Station Service</i> .	
DEPOT GROUNDS, additional—	
Algona, petition of Iowa Cent. & W. Ry. .....	44
Estherville, petition of B. O. R. & N. .....	37
Madson, by G. & N. W. Ry. .....	45
Oelwein, petition of C. G. W. Ry. Co. .....	36
Vinton, petition of B. C. R. & N. .....	39
West Liberty, application of C. R. I. & P. .....	43
DES MOINES, James Conger of, v. C. M. & St. P., train service .....	118
DES MOINES, NORTHERN & WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage .....	237
Dudley, W., Churdan, v., discrimination in freight rates .....	83
Harding, N. G., Des Moines, v., drainage .....	87
DES MOINES, N. G. Harding of, v. D. M., N. & W., drainage on farm .....	87
DES MOINES UNION—	
Officers, directors and mileage .....	239
DIGEST OF DECISIONS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION .....	255
DIGEST OF DECISIONS OF IOWA SUPREME COURT .....	267
DIRECTORS, OFFICERS AND MILEAGE OF RAILWAY COMPANIES .....	209
DISCRIMINATION IN RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .	
DIVIDENDS ON STOCKS OWNED .....	144, 146
DIVIDENDS ON STOCK, Iowa .....	146
Entire line .....	150
DOUGLAS, J. B., West Branch, v. B. C. R. & N., enforced removal of coal shed .....	96
DOWNNEY, D. B., Allison, v. C. G. W., right of shipper to choose market .....	123
DRAINAGE, complaints concerning—	
Harding, N. G., Des Moines, v. D. M., N. & W., on farm .....	87
Lynch, P., New Hampton, v. C. G. W., improper .....	89
Simmons, Charles H., Mapleton, v. C. M. & St. P., conversion of proper channel .....	83
DRAWBRIDGE AT FT. MADISON, interlocking system approved .....	127
DU BOIS, W. S., Rockwell City, v. C. M. & St. P., loading cars to marked capacity .....	134
DUBUQUE & SIOUX CITY RAILROAD COMPANY (Ill. Cent.) v. C. M. & St. P., grade crossing at Storm Lake .....	101
For complaints, see <i>Illinois Central</i> .	
Officers, directors and mileage .....	238
DUDLEY, W., Churdan, v. D. M., N. & W., discrimination in freight rates .....	83
DUNKREATH, A. E., Hollingsworth of, v. Ill. Cent., minimum weights on coal .....	51
<b>E</b> ARNINGS PER MILE OF ROAD, TRAIN MILE, ETC. ....	190-197
EARNINGS ON ROADS IN IOWA .....	152, 153, 154, 155
Entire line .....	156, 157, 158
EAST ELKPORT, M. Schnepf of, v. C. M. & St. P., delay in handling freight .....	73
EDMONDS, E. J., Marcus, v. C. St. P. M. & O., elevator site at Ashton .....	74
EJECTMENT FROM TRAIN—	
Marion, J. P., Jackson Junction, v. C. M. & St. P. ....	57
ELEVATORS, capacity of; answer to inquiry of Farmers Mutual Live Stock association .....	88
ELEVATOR EARNINGS—see <i>Earnings</i> .	



	PAGE
ELLIS, V. S., secretary Farmers Co-op. Ass'n, Swea City, v. B., C. R. & N., site for elevator	80
ELLSTON, W. Q. White et al. of, v. C., B. & Q., application of class "A" rates to H. & S.	103
ELWELL, M. L. Smith of, v. C., M. & St. P., site for elevator	117
EMPLOYEES OF RAILROADS, their integrity and reliability	13
EMPLOYEES OF RAILROADS IN IOWA, comparative table of for twenty-two years	12, 13
Accidents to, comparative table	13
EMPLOYEES AND SALARIES IN IOWA	181, 182, 183, 184
Entire line	185
EQUIPMENT, number of cars and locomotives	188, 189
EQUIPMENT TRUST OBLIGATIONS—see Bonds	
EQUIPMENT, cost of	142
ESTHERVILLE, additional depot grounds at, petition of B., C. R. & N.	37
ESTIMATED WEIGHTS—	
Townsend v. Ill. Cent., of brick	84
EXCESSIVE FREIGHT CHARGES—see Overcharge	
EXPENSES, operating, Iowa	158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165
Entire line	165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172
EXPRESS COMPANIES—see Earnings	
EXPRESS EARNINGS—see Earnings	
FAIRCHILD, E., Chester, v. C., M. & St. P., overcharge	106
FAIRFIELD, W. Adams of, v. C., B. & Q., abandonment of road	85
FARE, passenger, highest, lowest, etc.	190, 194
FARMERS CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, V. S. Ellis, secretary, Swea City, v. B., C. R. & N., site for elevator	80
FARMERS MUTUAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION, inquiry concerning elevator sites, etc.	87
FAST TRAINS STOPPING AT SMALL STATIONS	6
FAVILL, F. F., county attorney Buena Vista county, v. C. & N.-W., highway crossing	61
FIRE SET OUT BY ENGINES—	
Relchers, J. C., Point Lookout, Utah, v. C. & N.-W., damage to shocked barley	73
FLAGLER, J. V. H. Browne of, v. C., B. & Q. et al., damage to goods in transit	95
FORT DODGE & OMAHA RAILROAD COMPANY (Ill. Cent.) v. C., M. & St. P., grade crossing at Ardon	102
FORT MADISON, W. J. R. Beck of, v. St. L., K. & N. W., train service	79
Interlocking system on A., T. & S. F. drawbridge approved	37
FOSTER, T. M., North English, v. B., C. R. & N. overcharge on drugs	68
FREIGHT EARNINGS—see Earnings	
FREIGHT HAULED IN IOWA, classified tonnage table	198-204
FREIGHT, tons carried and carried one mile, etc.	191, 195
FRUM, S. B., Shelby, v. C., R. I. & P., site for coalhouse	52
FUEL CONSUMED BY LOCOMOTIVES	205
FUNDED DEBT	131-139
GARRETT, JESSE A., Orilla, v. C. G. W. Ry., station facilities	60
GASTON, H. F., Traer, v. I. M. & N.-W. (C. & N.-W.), undergrade farm crossing	116
GEORGE, W. C., Collins, v. C., M. & St. P., undergrade farm crossing for cattle	88
GRAY, O., Traer, v. I. M. & N.-W. (C. & N.-W.), undergrade farm crossing	113
GRAVES, J. G., township clerk, Cedar Rapids, v. C., M. & St. P., dangerous highway crossing	93
GRAY, W. A., Albia, v. Iowa Cent., private crossing at grade	69
HARDING, N. G., Des Moines, v. D. M., N. & W. et al., drainage	87
HARRINGTON, F. E., Marathon, v. C., M. & St. P., appropriating land for snow fence	92
HAVELOCK, J. H. Adams of, v. C. & N.-W., site for elevator, jurisdiction of board	107
HAYNES, WALTER E., and William Weston, Anita, v. C., R. I. & P., scarcity of cars	113
HIGHWAY CROSSINGS—see Crossings, Highway	
HILL, JESSE, et al., v. B., C. R. & N., shipping privileges at Pioneer Hay Camp	39
HILL & HALL, Wesley, v. C. R. G. & N. W., opening street crossing in Titonka	110
HIRE OF EQUIPMENT—see Earnings	
HOLLINGSWORTH, A. E., Dunreath, v. Ill. Cent., minimum weight marked capacity of car	51
HOOPER, C. G., West Branch, v. B., C. R. & N., dangerous highway crossing	82
HUMMER, GEORGE MERCANTILE COMPANY, Iowa City, v. B., C. R. & N., excessive rates	67

## ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY—

Officers, directors and mileage	238
Blackmore, E. L., et al., Applington, v., stopping fast train at Applington	39
Brown, W. S., Manson, v., demurrage charge	120
Hollingsworth, A. E., Dunreath, v., minimum weight the marked capacity of car	51
Plummer & Sons, W., New Hartford, v., overcharge (Interstate)	109
Plumer, William H., Logan, v., location of station	112
Stacy & Co., Osage, v., inquiry concerning shipper's right to load from wagons	121
Townsend, D. W., Cherokee, v., estimated weight of brick	84
Walters, H. F., Rockwell City, v., undergrade farm crossing	91
IMPROVEMENTS TO ROADBED IN IOWA	3
INCOME ACCOUNT OF ROADS IN IOWA	144, 145, 146, 147
INCOME ACCOUNT OF ENTIRE LINES	148, 149, 150, 151
INCOME BONDS—see Bonds	
INCOME, miscellaneous	140
INTERLOCKING SWITCHES IN IOWA, list of	10
Ottumwa crossing of C., M. & St. P., C. B. & Q. and C., R. I. & P.	37
Drawbridge at Ft. Madison on A., T. & S. F.	37
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, digest of decisions of	255
INTEREST ON BONDS OWNED	144, 145
INTEREST ON FUNDED DEBT AND INTEREST-BEARING CURRENT LIABILITIES	145, 149
IOWA CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Officers, directors and mileage	240
Gray, W. A., Albia, v., private crossing at grade	69
Leverton, John, Abbott, v., condition of stock yards	92
Leverton, John, Abbott, v., refusal to allow loading of cars from wagons	93
IOWA CITY, G. Hummer Mercantile company of, v. B., C. R. & N., excessive rates	67
IOWA EARNINGS AND EXPENSES, methods of apportioning	5
Comparative table of for twenty-two years	6
IOWA NORTHERN RAILWAY—	
Officers, directors and mileage	241
Irwine, Southall & Sons of, v. C. & N.-W., scarcity of cars	63
JACKSON JUNCTION, J. P. Marron of, v. C., M. & St. P., ejection from train	57
JOHNSON BROS., Rippey, v. C., R. I. & P., scarcity of cars	113
JOINT RATES	8
JONES, T. B., Beaconsfield, v. C., B. & Q., overcharge, two minimums	111
KARNATZ, JOHANN, et al., Boyd, v. C. G. W., petition for depot	84
KEOKUK & WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY v. C., R. I. & P., refusal to switch at Bevington Junction	76
Officers, directors and mileage	242
KANSAS CITY, ST. JOE & COUNCIL BLUFFS—	
Officers, directors and mileage	221
KIRON, A. Norells of, v. C. & N.-W., location of station	390
LA MOTTE, N. B., Nemmers of, v. C., M. & St. P., side track to elevator	71
LAW OF IOWA RELATING TO RAILWAYS—see also Appendix	12
LEVERTON, JOHN, Abbott, v. Iowa Cent., refusal to allow loading cars from wagons	93
LEVERTON, J., Abbott, v. Iowa Cent., condition of stock yards	99
LEWIS, DWIGHT N., elected secretary of board	15
Member of national committee on railroad statistics	15
LIABILITIES AND ASSETS, current	176, 177
LOADING CARS FROM WAGONS, right of shipper	120, 121
LOADING TO MARKED CAPACITY OF CARS	124
LOCATION OF STATION ON NEW LINE OF Ft. D. & O. Ry., between Woodbine and Logan	112
LOCKWOOD, L. N., Coldwater, v. I. M. & N.-W. (C. & N.-W.), undergrade farm crossing	104
LOCOMOTIVES, number of	188, 189
LOGAN, William H., Plumer of, v. Ft. D. & O. Rd. (Ill. Cent.), location of station	112
LYNCH, P., New Hampton, v. C. G. W. Ry., drainage and undergrade farm crossing	89
LYONS, PATRICK, Navan, v. C., M. & St. P., undergrade farm crossing	64



	PAGE
MAILS, earnings from—see <i>Earnings</i>	
MAIL SERVICE, M. R. De Busk, inquiry concerning	94
MANSON, additional depot grounds at, petition of G. & N. W. Ry.	45
W. S. Brown of, v. Ill. Cent., demurrage charges	120
MAPLETON, Charles H. Simmons of, v. C. M. & St. P., drainage	83
MARATHON, F. E. Harrington of, v. C. M. & St. P., appropriating land for snow fence	92
MARRON, J. P., Jackson Junction, v. C. M. & St. P., wrongful ejectment from train	57
MARSHALLTOWN & DAKOTA RAILWAY— Officers, directors and mileage	214
MARCUS, E. J. Edmonds of, v. C. St. P., M. & O., elevator site at Ashton	74
MASON CITY & Ft. Dodge— Officers, directors and mileage	243
MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES ON HAND	177
MILEAGE IN IOWA	179, 180
Comparative table of for twenty-two years	6
MILEAGE, entire lines	178
MILEAGE TRAFFIC TABLES, IOWA	190, 191, 192, 193
Entire lines	194, 195, 196, 197
MILEAGE OF TRAINS, all kinds	193, 197
MILEAGE, OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF RAILWAY COMPANIES	209
MILES OF NEW RAILROAD IN IOWA	4
MINIMUM WEIGHT, complaints concerning— Mt. Pleasant Milling company v. C. B. & Q., on flour in sacks, too high	98
Pearson & Hayton, Pierson, v. C. M. & St. P., overcharge account of	95
MINIMUM WEIGHT ON COAL MARKED CAPACITY OF CAR. Hollingsworth, A. E., Dunreath, v. Ill. Cent.	51
MINNEAPOLIS & ST. LOUIS RAILWAY— Officers, directors and mileage	243
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, tonnage crossing	206
MISSOURI RIVER, tonnage crossing	206
MOSCOW, G. F. Schafnit of, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to furnish car for corn	77
MT. PLEASANT MILLING COMPANY, Mt. Pleasant, v. C. B. & Q., minimum weight on sack flour	98
MOWRY, WELCOME, of Tama county, elected commissioner to succeed Hon. George W. Perkins	15
Member of national committee on classification of construction expenses	15
MUSCATINE, Niver Iron Works of, v. B. C. R. & N., refusal to switch	82
MUSCATINE NORTH & SOUTH RAILROAD CO.— Officers, directors and mileage	244
NAVAN, P. Lynch of, v. C. M. & St. P., undergrade farm crossing	64
NEMMERS, N. B., Lamotte, v. C. M. & St. P., side track to elevator	71
NEVADA, George C. White of, v. C. & N.-W., scarcity of cars	121
NEW HAMPTON, P. Lynch of, v. C. G. W., drainage under crossing	89
NEW HARTFORD, J. W. Plummer & Sons of, v. Ill. Cent., overcharge	100
NIWER IRON WORKS, Muscatine, v. B. C. R. & N., refusal to switch	82
NORBLING, A., Kiron, v. C. & N.-W., location of station	100
NORTH ENGLISH, T. M. Foster of, v. B. C. R. & N., overcharge on drugs	68
OLWEIN, additional depot grounds at, petition of C. G. W. Ry.	36
City of, v. C. G. W. Ry., improper construction of viaduct	81
OFFICERS, DIRECTORS AND MILEAGE OF RAILWAY COMPANIES	209
OLINE BROS., Page Center, v. C. B. & Q., petition for agent	49
OMAHA & ST. LOUIS RAILWAY COMPANY— Officers, directors and mileage	245
Strahan, citizens of, v. stopping fast train at small station	78
OPERATING EXPENSES—see <i>Expenses</i>	
ORGANIZATION OF BOARD	15
ORILLIA, Jesse A. Garrett of, v. C. G. W., station facilities	60
OSAG, Stacy & Co. of, v. Ill. Cent., right to load cars from wagons	121
OTTUMWA, interlocking switch at approved	33

## OVERCHARGE—

Beeman, C. D., Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., on hard coal (interstate)	109
Conroy, P. T., Walnut, v. C. R. I. & P., on shipment of stock cattle	97
Cresswell, John, Bonaparte, v. C. Ft. M. & D. M. Rd. Co., stock cattle (interstate)	125
Fairchild, E., Chester, v. C. M. & St. P., on horses (interstate)	106
Foster, T. M., North English, v. B. C. R. & N., on drugs	68
Jones, T. B., Beaconsfield, v. C. B. & Q. and H. & S., minimum charges	111
Mt. Pleasant Milling company v. C. B. & Q., on account minimum weight on sacks of flour	98
Pearson & Hayton, Pierson, v. C. & N.-W., on account minimum weight	95
Plummer, J. W. & Sons, v. Ill. Cent., on apples (interstate)	109
Reeves, H., Decorah, v. C. M. & St. P., on hogs (interstate)	108
Townsend, D. W., Cherokee, v. Ill. Cent., estimated weight of brick	84

OVERHEAD HIGHWAY CROSSINGS—see *Crossings, Highway*.

OWEGO, A. L. Patterson of, v. C. M. & St. P., scarcity of cars	114
PAGE CENTER, Oline Bros. of, v. C. B. & Q., petition for agent	49
Palmer, D. J., elected chairman of board	15
Member of national committee on uniform classification of freights	15

PASSENGER EARNINGS—see *Earnings*.

PASSENGERS, number of carried and carried one mile	190, 194
PATTERSON, A. L., Owego, v. C. M. & St. P., scarcity of cars	114
PEARSON & HAYTON, Pierson, v. C. & N.-W., overcharge, minimum weight	95
PICKERING, J. C., Cedar Rapids, inquiry concerning demurrage charges	114
PIERCE & GLASS, Winfield, v. B. & N. W. Ry., delay in tile shipment	90
PIERSON, Pearson & Hayton of, v. C. & N.-W., overcharge, minimum weight	95
William Southall & Sons of, v. C. & N.-W., scarcity of cars	63
PIONEER HAY CAMP, shipping facilities at	29
PLUMMER, WILLIAM H., Logan, v. Ft. D. & O. Rd. (Ill. Cent.), location of station	112
PLUMMER, J. W. & Sons, New Hartford, v. Ill. Cent., overcharge	109
POINT LOOKOUT, Utah, J. C. Relethers of, v. C. & N.-W., fire from engine	73
PRIVATE CROSSINGS—see <i>Crossings, Farm</i>	
PRODUCTS HAULED IN IOWA, classified list showing tons	198-204
PULLING OFF TRAIN—see <i>Ejectment from Train</i>	

RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS' CONVENTION	14
RAILROAD CROSSINGS AT GRADE, should they be permitted	11
RAILROADS IN IOWA, new lines	4
RAILS AND TIES, renewals of	187
RAILS, new, laid in Iowa	187
RAEMUSEN, A. D., et al. v. B. C. R. & N., shipping privileges at Pioneer Hay Camp	29
RATES, coal rates in Iowa	9
RATES, joint	8
RATES, complaint concerning, Best, J. W., Villisca, v. C. B. & Q., interstate, excessive	73
Dudley, W., Churdan, v. D. M. N. & W., discrimination in freight rates	82
Hummer, G., Mercantile Co., Iowa City, v. B. C. R. & N., excessive interstate	67
White, W. Q., et al., Ellston, v. C. B. & Q., application of class A rates to H. & S. Rd.	103
Reeves, Henry, Decorah, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive freight charges	108
REFUSAL TO ALLOW LOADING CARS FROM WAGONS— Levertown v. Iowa Central	92
REFUSAL TO FURNISH CARS—see <i>Scarcity of Cars</i>	
REFUSAL TO SWITCH CARS—see <i>Switching</i>	
REMOVAL OF COAL SHED, warehouses, elevators, etc.—see <i>Site</i>	
RENTALS, earnings from—see <i>Earnings</i>	
RENTALS RECEIVED, rentals paid, etc	140
RENTS	145, 149
REPAIRS AND RENEWALS, cost of—see <i>Expenses</i>	
RETURNS OF RAILROAD COMPANIES COMPILED	120-205
RICHERS, J. C., Point Lookout, Utah, v. C. & N.-W., damage by fire from locomotive	78
RIGHT OF SHIPPERS TO LOAD CARS FROM WAGONS	118
RILEY, JOHN W., Defiance, v. C. M. & St. P., scarcity of cars	124
RIPLEY, Johnson Bros. of, v. C. R. I. & P., scarcity of cars	113
RIVER JUNCTION, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N., petition for telegraph operator	33



	PAGE
ROADBED, permanent improvements in Iowa.....	5
ROAD, cost of.....	142
ROCKWELL CITY, W. S. Du Bois of, v. C. M. & St. P., loading cars to marked capacity.....	124
ROCKWELL CITY, H. F. Walters of, v. Ft. Dodge & Omaha Ry., under crossing.....	91
<b>SAINT LOUIS, KEOKUK &amp; NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—</b>	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	222
Beck, W. J. R., Ft. Madison, v. train service.....	79
SCARCITY OF CARS DISCUSSED.....	10
<b>SCARCITY OF CARS, complaints concerning—</b>	
Akron Milling company v. C. M. & St. P.....	123
Bruning Bros., Breda, v. C. & N.-W., for grain shipments.....	66
Johnson Bros., Rippey, v. C. & N.-W., for grain.....	113
Patterson, A. L., Owego, v. C. M. & St. P., for wheat.....	114
Riley, John W., Defiance, v. C. M. & St. P.....	124
Schafnit, G. F., Moscow, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to furnish for ear corn.....	77
Southall, William & Sons, v. C. & N.-W., for shipment of grain.....	63
Weston, William, Anita, v. C. R. I. & P., for grain.....	118
White, George O., Nevada, v. C. & N.-W., right to load cars from wagons.....	121
SCHAFNIT, G. F., Moscow, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to furnish for ear corn.....	77
SCHNEPP, M., East Elkport, v. C. M. & St. P., delay in handling freight.....	73
<b>SENDING CARS OFF OWN LINE—</b>	
Smith, E. F., Wellman, v. B. C. R. & N.....	112
SHELBY, S. B., Frum of, v. C. R. I. & P., site for coalhouse.....	52
"SHRINKER," used on scales to defraud sellers of produce.....	72
<b>SIDE TRACK, complaint concerning—</b>	
Nemmers, N. B., Lamotte, v. C. M. & St. P., to elevator.....	71
SIMMONS, CHARLES H., Mapleton, v. C. M. & St. P., drainage.....	83
<b>SIoux CITY &amp; NORTHERN—</b>	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	245
<b>SIoux CITY &amp; PACIFIC RAILROAD—</b>	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	235
<b>SITE, applications for, etc.—</b>	
Adams, J. H., Havelock, v. C. & N.-W., for elevator, jurisdiction of commissioners.....	107
Douglas, J. B., West Branch, v. B. C. R. & N., enforced removal of coalshed.....	95
Edmonds, E. J., Marcus, v. C. St. P., M. & O., elevator site at Ashton.....	74
Farmers Co-operative association, Swea City, v. B. C. R. & N., for elevator.....	80
Farmers Mutual Live Stock association, inquiry concerning.....	87
Frum, S. B., Shelby, v. C. R. I. & P., for coalhouse.....	52
At Pioneer Hay Camp, application by A. D. Rasmussen et al. for elevator on B. C. R. & N.....	29
Smith, M. L., Elwell, v. C. M. & St. P., for elevator.....	117
SLIFE, M., Dedham, v. C. M. & St. P., loading cars to marked capacity.....	124
SMITH, E. F., Wellman, v. B. C. R. & N., sending cars off own line.....	112
SMITH, M. L., Elwell, v. C. M. & St. P., site for elevator.....	117
SMITH, R. H. et al., West Branch, v. B. C. R. & N., dangerous highway crossing.....	52
SOUTHALL, WILLIAM & SONS, Pierson, v. C. & N.-W., scarcity of cars.....	63
STACY & CO., Osage, v. Ill. Cent., right to load cars from wagons.....	121
<b>STACYVILLE RAILROAD—</b>	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	239
<b>STATION, location of on new line near town already established—</b>	
Norellis v. C. & N.-W., at Kiron.....	100
STATIONS IN IOWA, number of.....	187
<b>STATION FACILITIES, complaints concerning—</b>	
Boyd, citizens of, v. C. G. W. Ry., petition for depot.....	84
Garrett, J. A., Orilla, v. C. G. W., day agent.....	60
Oline Bros., Page Center, v. C. B. & Q., petition for agent.....	49
River Junction, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N., petition for telegraph operator.....	33
Sumner, on C. G. W. Ry.....	115
<b>STATISTICAL TABLES SHOWING RETURNS OF RAILROAD COMPANIES.....</b>	
STATISTICS, difficulty of obtaining reliable information respecting Iowa statistics.....	5
<b>STATUTES OF IOWA RELATING TO RAILWAYS—see, also, Appendix.....</b>	

	PAGE
STOCK, capital, table of.....	129, 130, 137
STOCKS OWNED.....	138
STOCK PER MILE.....	137
<b>STOCK YARD EARNINGS—see Earnings.</b>	
<b>STOCK YARDS, complaint concerning—</b>	
Leverton, J., Abbott, v. Iowa Cent., unfit condition of.....	99
<b>STOPPING FAST TRAINS AT SMALL TOWNS, complaints concerning—see Train Service.</b>	
<b>STOPPING THROUGH TRAINS AT SMALL STATIONS.....</b>	
STORM LAKE, grade railroad crossing at, D. & S. C. v. C. M. & St. P.....	101
STRAHAN, Citizens of, v. O. & St. L., stopping fast train.....	78
SUMNER, depot facilities at, furnished by C. G. W. Ry.....	115
<b>SURPLUS AND DEFICIT SHOWINGS, Iowa.....</b>	
Entire line.....	150
SWEA CITY, Farmers Co-operative association of, v. B. C. R. & N., site for elevator.....	80
<b>SWITCHING CHARGES, earnings from—see Earnings.</b>	
<b>SWITCHING, complaints concerning—</b>	
Niver Iron Works, Muscatine, v. B. C. R. & N., refusal to switch.....	82
K. & W. Ry. v. C. R. I. & P. Ry., refusal to switch car at Bevington Junction.....	76
<b>SYLLABI OF CASES DECIDED BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.....</b>	
<b>SYLLABI OF DECISIONS OF STATE SUPREME COURT.....</b>	
TAXES.....	145, 149
<b>TAXES PAID IN IOWA AND OTHER STATES.....</b>	
TABOR & NORTHERN RAILWAY—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	246
<b>TELEGRAPH EARNINGS—see Earnings.</b>	
<b>TELEPHONE IN DEPOT AT RIVER JUNCTION.....</b>	
TIES LAID IN IOWA.....	187
TIOTKA, opening street in on C. R. G. & N.-W., Hill & Hall, Wesley.....	110
<b>TONNAGE CROSSING MISSISSIPPI AND MISSOURI RIVERS.....</b>	
TONNAGE IN IOWA, classified.....	198, 199, 200
Entire line.....	201, 202, 203, 204
<b>Tons, classified, carried on railroads in Iowa.....</b>	
Entire line.....	191, 195
Tons, number of, in train and cars.....	191, 195
TOWNSEND, D. W., Cherokee, v. Ill. Cent. Rd. Co., estimated weight of brick.....	84
<b>TRACK-BUYERS, refusal to allow loading cars from wagons—</b>	
Leverton v. Iowa Cent.....	96
TRACK-BUYERS, right to load cars from wagons.....	118, 121
TRAER, H. F., Gaston of, v. I. M. & N.-W. (C. & N.-W.), undergrade farm crossing.....	116
TRAER, O., Gravatt of, v. I. M. & N.-W. (C. & N.-W.), undergrade farm crossing.....	113
<b>TRAIN BRAKES—see Air Brakes.</b>	
<b>TRAIN MILEAGE, or miles run by different trains.....</b>	
TRAIN SERVICE, complaints concerning—	
Beck, W. J. R., Ft. Madison, v. St. L. K. & N.-W., insufficient.....	79
Blackmore, E. L., et al., Appleton, v. Ill. Cent., stopping through train.....	38
Conger, James, Des Moines, v. C. M. & St. P., insufficient number of trains.....	118
Strahan, citizens of, v. O. & St. L., stopping fast train.....	78
<b>TRANSPORTATION COST OF—see Expenses.</b>	
<b>TRESTLES, number of.....</b>	
<b>UNDERGRADE CROSSINGS—see Crossings.</b>	
<b>VALUE OF ROAD AND EQUIPMENT, actual present cash.....</b>	
VIADUCT, complaints concerning—	
Davenport, city of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	71
Oelwein, city of, v. C. G. W. Ry., improper construction of.....	81
VILLISCA, W. J. Best of, v. C. B. & Q., excess rate, interstate.....	72
VINCENNES, J. B. Cruze of, v. C. R. I. & P., farm crossing.....	68
VINTON, additional depot grounds at, petition of B. C. R. & N.....	88



	PAGE
WALNUT, P. T. Conroy of, v. C., R. I. & P., overcharge on stock cattle.....	97
WALNUT, township trustees of, v. C., R. I. & P., overhead highway crossing.....	54
WABASH RAILROAD—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	247
WALTERS, H. F., Rockwell City, v. Ft. D. & O. Ry., undergrade farm crossing.....	91
WAUKON, C. D. Beeman of, v. C., M. & St. P., excess rate on hard coal.....	109
WELLMAN, E. F. Smith of, v. B., C. R. & N., sending cars off own line.....	112
WESLEY, Hill & Hall of, v. C. R. G. & N.-W., opening street in Titonka.....	110
WEST BRANCH, citizens of, et al., v. B., C. R. & N., dangerous highway crossing.....	52
WEST BRANCH, J. B. Douglas of, v. B., C. R. & N., enforced removal of coal shed.....	96
WEST LIBERTY, additional depot grounds at, petition of C., R. I. & P.....	43
WESTON, Wm., Anita, v. C., R. I. & P., scarcity of cars.....	118
WHITE, GEO. O., Nevada, v. C. & N.-W., scarcity of cars.....	121
WHITE, W. Q., et al., Ellston, v. C., B. & Q. and H. & S., application of class A rates to H. & S.....	103
WINFIELD, Pierce & Glass of, v. B. & N.-W., delay in tile shipment.....	90
WINONA & WESTERN RAILROAD—	
Officers, directors and mileage.....	249
WIOTA, M. R. De Busk of, in matter of mail service.....	94
WRONGFUL EJECTMENT FROM TRAIN—see <i>Ejectment from Train</i> .	

## TOPICAL INDEX

To all Volumes--1878 to 1899 inclusive.

	YEAR.	PAGE
ABANDONMENT OF ROAD.		
Adams, Walter, Fairfield, v. C., B. & Q.....	1899	85
Clarinda, citizens of, v. C. & St. L., abandonment of C. & St. L. R'y.....	1889	1041
Elkader, citizens of, v. C., M. & St. P.....	1886	473
Fort Dodge, citizens of, v. C., R. I. & P. et al., Tara & Ft. Dodge.....	1889	982, 987
Supreme court decision in, referred to.....	1892	2
General subject discussed.....	1889	44
Northwood, citizens of, v. Central Iowa.....	1882	468
Northwood, citizens of, v. Iowa Central, petition for rehearing.....	1883	599
Court proceedings in.....	1884, 45	xxxix
Ottumwa & Kirkville, 33.3 mi., Clarinda, St. Louis, 11.5.....	1891	5
Rights of contracting parties protected by courts.....	1889	1043
Expenses incurred in constructing spur track, parties entitled to return of, on abandonment of track.....	1891	738
W. & W. R'y, Osage, for temporary removal.....	1895	196
ABANDONMENT OF STATION—see also <i>Station</i> .		
Bismarck, Neil & Campbell v. C., M. & St. P.....	1889	992
Kingston, Decatur county, citizens of, v. D. M. & K. C., protest against removal.....	1890	863
Leslie, citizens of, v. D. M. & K. C., protest against abandonment of station.....	1889	1027
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Dey.....	1889	1030
Pekin, Spiers & Richardson v. B. & W., petition for reopening.....	1890	852
Veo, Jones, J. M., v. B. & M., petition for reopening of station.....	1890	938
ABSORPTION OF BRIDGE TOLL—see <i>Bridge Toll</i> .		
ACCIDENTS TO PERSONS.		
Remarks of President Harrison.....	1892, 18;	1895 70
Comparative tables 1878 to 1899.....	1899	13, 14
ACCIDENTS—INVESTIGATION OF.		
Law concerning reporting of, repealed.....	1898	6
Afton, C., B. & Q.....	1887	148
Altoona.....	1878	45
Brush Siding, on C., B. & Q.....	1893	269
Coon Rapids, on C., M. & St. P.....	1891	843
Crescent, on C. & N.-W., near Council Bluffs.....	1893	271
Des Moines, collision between C., R. I. & P. fair ground train and C. & N.-W. freight train at, report of commissioners.....	1889	1114
Danger to boys playing around trains, etc., B., C. R. & N.....	1891	841
Eagle Point, C., M. & St. P.....	1887	153
Glendale, on C., M. & St. P., investigation of by commissioners.....	1889	1107
Highland Center, C., M. & St. P.....	1892	873
Inwood, C., M. & St. P.....	1887	162
Nansen, seven miles southeast of Council Bluffs, on C. & St. L.....	1890	901
New Hampton, on C. G. W. R'y.....	1892	871
Maynard, on B., C. R. & N.....	1891	839
Stratford, on C. & N.-W.....	1893	270
Stratford, on C. & N.-W.....	1891	845
Valley Junction, on C., R. I. & P.....	1895	241
Vincent, C., R. I. & P.....	1891	841
Washington, on C., R. I. & P.....	1891	841
ACCOUNTS—RAILWAY.		
Bureau of Railway Statistics and Accounts, railway question.....	1893	40g
Law requiring uniformity in, recommended.....	1892	21
Uniformity in.....	1878, 74; 1879, 113; 1883, 38; 1892	45



	YEAR	PAGE
<b>ACTUAL CASH VALUE OF ROAD AND EQUIPMENT—see Value.</b>		
ADAMS, CHARLES FRANCIS, JR., quotation from.....	1878	59
Discussion of commissioner system.....	1879	73
Railroads, origin and problems.....	1881	81
Remarks on watered stock.....	1886	55
ADAMS, HENRY C., statistician Interstate com. com., paper on accounts, etc.....	1893	40g
<b>ADEQUATE EQUIPMENT DEFINED—see Equipment.</b>		
<b>ADEQUATE CROSSING—see Crossing, Adequate.</b>		
<b>ADOPTION OF COMMISSIONERS' RATES—see Rates.</b>		
<b>ADDITIONAL DEPOT GROUNDS—see Condemnation Proceedings.</b>		
<b>ADVANCED CHARGES.</b>		
Brenneck Bros., Eagle Grove, v. O. & N.-W., discrimination in applying.....	1892	842
Monahan Bros., Charlotte, v. O. & N.-W.....	1886	525
Wasson, J. A., Roscoe, Kan., v. O., M. & St. P., duties of carriers in accepting guarantee for.....	1883	656
<b>ADVANCE IN HAY RATES, PETITION OF D. M. &amp; N. W.—see Rates.</b>		
<b>AGENTS, STATION, PETITION FOR—see Station Service.</b>		
AGREEMENTS BETWEEN RAILWAYS, violation of.....	1886	57
AGREEMENT OF RAILWAY COMPANIES TO ADOPT COMMISSIONERS' RATES—see Rates, Freight.		
<b>AID TO RAILROADS—see Taxes.</b>		
AINSWORTH, W. W., elected secretary .....	1887	3
Re-elected.....1888, 3; 1889, 4; 1890, 3; 1891, 3; 1892, 3; 1893, 3; 1894, 3; 1895, 1v; 1896, 12; 1897		
<b>APPORTIONMENT OF COST OF OVER AND UNDER RAILROAD CROSSINGS—see Crossing, Railroad.</b>		
APPROPRIATION OF LAND, Harrington, F. E., Marathon, v. O., M. & St. P., for snow fence.....	1890	92
<b>APPROPRIATION OF COAL.</b>		
Aurelia, coal dealers of, v. Illinois Central railroad, during scarcity of fuel.....	1888	677
Hogaboom, S. R., Creston, v. O., B. & Q.....	1894	286
Knowles, J. Elliott, v. O., B. & Q.....	1881	140
Le Mars, Townsend, D. W., v. Illinois Central.....	1888	679
<b>ARBITRATION.</b>		
Ashburn, J. M. Lamoni, v. O., B. & Q., claim for car of stock.....	1889	939
Consolidation Coal Company v. Central Iowa.....	1878	20
Illinois Central et al. v. Waverly Short Line et al., grade crossing.....	1886	576
Mason City & Ft. Dodge R'y Co. v. Crooked Creek R'y Co., grade crossing.....	1887	732
Moore, Thos. and Bisbee, C. W., Turin, v. O. & N.-W., overflow damages.....	1889	999
Webster City & Crooked Creek v. M. C. & Ft. D. R'y Co., grade crossing .....	1886	598, 601
ATTENDANCE with L. O. L. live stock shipments.....	1894	347
<b>ATTORNEY-GENERAL, REPORT OF—see Litigation.</b>		
<b>AUTOMATIC COUPLERS—see also Couplers, Automatic.</b>		
Paper on, by Commissioner Coffin.....	1885	92
Brakes, Burlington test.....1884, 40; 1886, 46, 47, 48		
Generally used.....	1898	4
<b>AUTHORITY OF COMMISSIONERS—see Commissioners.</b>		
<b>BAD ORDER, RECEIPT OF GOODS IN—see Damages.</b>		
<b>BACK WATER, CAUSED BY RAILROAD CONSTRUCTION, OVERFLOW—see Drainage, Damages, Obstruction and Overflow.</b>		
<b>BACK WATER, IN RELATION TO RAILROAD CROSSINGS—see Drainage.</b>		
<b>BACK WATER, STOOK DROWNED BY—see Damages.</b>		
BAGGAGE—EXCESS AND STORAGE CHARGES. Discussion of.....	1891	23
Anderson, T., Rockford, Ill., v. O., M. & St. P., sample trunks containing jewelry not baggage.....	1885	541
Ashall, F. O., Chicago, v. Central Iowa, excess charges.....	1882	433
Bullock, N. P., Leon, v. Union Depot, Council Bluffs, storage.....	1887	724
Carpenter, O. C., Gilman, v. Cent. Iowa and O. & N.-W., refusal to receive tool chest as baggage .....	1886	528
Dusey, H., et al., Creston, v. O., B. & Q., refusal to carry mechanics' tool box as baggage.....	1885	513
Edmundson, Ed., Cedar Rapids, v. O., M. & St. P., excess baggage.....	1892	824

	Year	Page
<b>BAGGAGE—EXCESS AND STORAGE CHARGES—Continued—</b>		
Glover, H. B., et al., Dubuque, v. various lines, excess baggage charges.....	1883	630
Goodwin, Mrs. Patience, Traer, v. O., R. I. & P., delay and storage charges.....	1883	645
Hollenbeck, Mrs. E. A., Wesley, v. O. & N.-W. R'y, excessive.....	1898	71
Krause & Co., Davenport, v. various lines.....	1894	250
<b>BAGGAGE—DELAY AND LOSS—</b>		
Block, M., Des Moines, v. O. & N.-W., delay in forwarding sample case.....	1892	853
Taylor, R. B., West Side, v. O. & N.-W., lost.....	1885	571
Woodward, W. H., Creston, v. D. M. & K. C., lost.....	1891	727
<b>BAGGAGE, INSUFFICIENT FACILITIES FOR HANDLING AND TRANSFER—see also Transfer Facilities.</b>		
Roybar, F., v. Cent. Iowa et al., insufficient facilities for handling baggage.....	1886	588
Iowa Falls v. O. & N.-W., regulations .....	1887	753
Reynard, J. S., Creston, v. O., B. & Q. and O. G. W., Afton Junction transfer.....	1893	137
<b>BANKRUPT ROADS—see Receivers.</b>		
BILLING IN TRANSIT, Bevins Bros., Hawkeye, v. O., M. & St. P., discrimination in .....	1896	79
BIRD, A. C., G. F. A. C. M. & St. P., LETTER OF, on reduction of corn rates in Iowa.....	1886	621
BLACK, JEREMIAH, LETTER OF, on railway legislation, railways are highways, etc. 1881		77
<b>BLOCKADING HIGHWAY WITH TRAINS—see Obstruction.</b>		
<b>BLOCKADING STREETS WITH TRAINS—see Obstructing Streets.</b>		
<b>BLOCKADE, SNOW—see Snow Blockade.</b>		
<b>BRANCH LINES—</b>		
Apportioning earnings of, method of .....	1889	1005
Expenses of operation should be partly borne by main line .....	1883	47
Profitable as feeders to main lines.....	1889	1005
Train service on, restoration of, on Iowa branches, O., R. I. & P.....	1889	10-1008
<b>BRANCH LINES, TRAIN SERVICE ON—see also Train Service.</b>		
<b>BRAKES, AUTOMATIC AND POWER—see also Automatic Couplers and Power Brakes.</b>		
Brakes, automatic.....1884, 41; 1885		94
Discussion of and law concerning.....1890, 7; 1891, 18, 20; 1892		10, 46
Paper on by Commissioner Coffin .....	1889	47
BREWER, JUDGE, decision of, in relation to rates—see also Rates.....	1889	31, 32, 34
Temporary injunction by restraining promulgation of June, 1888, schedule 1888, 36	1894	208
<b>BRIDGES—</b>		
Wooden, being replaced by iron and stone.....	1898	4
<b>Laws relating to, discussed.....</b>		
Safety of, railroad companies responsible for.....	1878	17
Bridge toll, absorption of, at Omaha .....	1878	17, 18, 19
Bridge toll, absorption of, at Omaha .....	1886	670
<b>UNSAFE CONDITION OF—see also Unsafe Condition of Road.</b>		
Fay, P. H., Richland Center, Wis., v. O., M. & St. P., Coon Rapids.....	1894	176
Harrison, H., et al., v. A., T. & S. F., neglect of bridgeman at Ft. Madison.....	1895	199
Reno, B. F., Marengo, v. O., R. I. & P.....	1880	73
Waller, J. N., road supervisor, St. Charles, v. O., M. & St. P., unsafe condition of bridge and highway .....	1886	569
Watkins, W. W., Bellevue, v. O., M. & St. P., unsafe condition of bridge.....	1889	1012
<b>"BUGGY CASE"—</b>		
Barber, Ed., Glidden, v. O., & N.-W., overcharge.....	1884	65-67
Anderson's, commissioner, opinion on.....	1884	49
Coffin's, commissioner, opinion on .....	1884	57
Dey's, commissioner, opinion on .....	1884	63
Judge Baylies' opinion on.....	1885	57
<b>BURLINGTON, SHIPPERS OF, COMPLAINT ON RATES—see Rates.</b>		
<b>BURLINGTON, CEDAR RAPIDS &amp; NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY, application of, for reduced rates on seed grain .....</b>		
1892		838
<b>BURLINGTON TEST OF AUTOMATIC COUPLERS—see Automatic Couplers.</b>		
<b>BUTTER AND EGG SHIPMENT, DISCRIMINATION IN INSPECTION OF—see Inspection.</b>		
<b>CABOOSE, STOPPAGE OF AT PLATFORMS—see Stopping Trains at Platforms.</b>		
CAMERON, J. S., ELECTED SECRETARY.....	1878	3
Resigned.....	1880	3
<b>CAMP MEETING AND OTHER ASSEMBLY RATE—see Rates.</b>		



CAPACITY OF ELEVATORS—see *Elevators*.CAPACITY OF FREIGHT CARS—see *Cars*.CAPITAL STOCK, WATERED—see *Watered Stock*.

CAPITALIZATION, EXCESSIVE..... 1878 39

CARE OF STATION BUILDINGS—see *Station Service*.

CARS.

DISCRIMINATION IN FURNISHING—see *Discrimination and Failure to Furnish Cars*.DISTRIBUTION OF—see *Distribution of Cars*.

Must be distributed equally in time of scarcity..... 1888, 719; 1892 827

Not to be used for warehouse purposes..... 1889 996

WHEN USED FOR WAREHOUSE PURPOSES, CHARGES FOR—see *Demurrage*.LACK OF—see also *Failure to Furnish Cars*.

Discussed by L. S. Coffin..... 1887 70

SENDING OFF OWN LINE—see *Refusal to Receive and Forward Freight*.

WARMING OF.

LIGHTING OF—see *Lighting Cars*.WHAT CONSTITUTES ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF—see *Equipment*.

CAR LOAD RATES.

Attempted abolition of..... 1885, 45, 47; 1886 31

Iowa State Jobbers and Manufacturers' association, protest against abolition of 1885 47

Merrill &amp; Keeney, Des Moines, v. C. &amp; N.-W. et al., on furniture..... 1883, 678; 1894 69

On mixed car load of linseed and carbon oils..... 1892 844

Proposition to abolish indefinitely postponed..... 1885 53

Recognition of by Colorado law..... 1885 48

CARS OFF ITS OWN LINE—see *Refusal to Receive and Forward Freight*, also *Failure to**Furnish Cars*.

OWNED BY SHIPPER, unjust discrimination of, paper on, by Judge Schoonmaker,

ex-interstate commerce commissioner..... 1891 30

PRIVATE, DISCRIMINATION IN USE OF—see *Discrimination*.

CARRIERS.

Bound by quotation of rates by agents..... 1886 609

Their relations to each other discussed..... 1884 7

CARRIER'S RISK—see *Owner's Risk*.

CARRIED PAST STATION.

Boyle, I. W., Clarkville, v. O. G. W., carried past station..... 1889, 961; 1892 852

Lightner, F. E., Carthage, Mo., v. O. G. W..... 1897 137

Windell, W. S., Castalia, v. C. &amp; M. &amp; St. P., refusal to stop at Castalia..... 1892 862

CARRYING PASSENGERS ON FREIGHT TRAINS—see *Train Service*.CASH VALUE—see *Value, Present Cash*.CATTLE GUARDS—see also *Crossings*.

Bell, W. S., Des Moines, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., refusal to construct..... 1889 1066

Campbell, F. R., et al., Bismarck, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., danger to cattle from location

of fence, petition for cattle guards..... 1892 856-857

Chapman, H. G., Sioux City, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., petition for..... 1892 795

Frazier, George, Panora, v. D. M. N. &amp; W., defective, stock killed..... 1897 110

Gardner, John M., Leon, v. D. M. O. &amp; S., cattle guards and fencing..... 1884 549

Jamison, J. R., Okaloosa, v. C. B. &amp; Q., failure to put in..... 1882 556

Jarvis, M., Morning Sun, v. Iowa Central, petition for..... 1895 159

Long, Ira, Luther, v. St. L., D. M. &amp; N., application for at farm crossing..... 1888 737

Mohr, John, Fort Dodge, v. M. C. &amp; Ft. D., application for..... 1887 739

McCall, W. R., Ogden, v. M. &amp; St. L., petition for..... 1885 556

Moore, N. B., Clarinda, v. C. B. &amp; Q., cattle guards at crossing..... 1883 487

Onerem, J. L., et al., Thor, v. C. &amp; N.-W., petition for cattle guards..... 1885 558

Petition for rehearing..... 1886 571

Tibbets, D. D., et al., Ogden, v. O., Ft. M. &amp; D. M., petition for..... 1892 827

CHANGING NAME OF STATIONS.

Arlington, citizens of, petition for, C. M. &amp; St. P., from Brush Creek to v..... 1896 19

Enfield, Cooley, E. G., v. C. M. &amp; St. P., Strawberry Point..... 1884 563

Luverne, citizens of, v. C. &amp; N.-W., application for..... 1887, 730; 1888 705

River Junction, Musser, J. D., et al., v. B. C. R. &amp; N., petition for..... 1888, 749; 1893 211

Sewal, Banta, Ira, v. C. M. &amp; St. P..... 1895 145

Strawberry Point, citizens of, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., petition for..... 1888 734

Ticonic, Grant township, citizens of, v. C. &amp; D., petition for..... 1888 725

Vincent, Anderson &amp; Richards, v. C. R. I. &amp; P..... 1892 833

CHARGES—

Crary Bros., Boone, v. St. L., D. &amp; N., prepayment of freight charges..... 1886 604

Wasson, J. A., Roscoe, Kan., v. C. M. &amp; St. P., duties of carriers..... 1883 656

CHARITY FREIGHT—

Shaw, H. B., Nora Springs, free carriage of..... 1895 166

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS, churches not such, as contemplated by law, with

respect to special rates (Commissioner Day)..... 1888 838

CHOICE OF MARKETS, SHIPPERS AND ROUTES, RIGHT TO—see *Rights of Shippers*.

CHURCHES may obtain special rates on building material..... 1888 837

CLAIMS—see also *Damages*.FOR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM OBSTRUCTIONS—see *Obstruction*.FOR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM FAILURE TO RECEIVE CARS—see *Failure to Fur-**nish Cars*.FOR REFUND OF OVERCHARGE—see *Overcharge*.

Private, commissioners no authority to collect..... 1889 1082

FOR GOODS LOST IN TRANSIT—see *Lost in Transit*.FOR STOCK KILLED—see *Stock Killed*.

CLASSIFICATION OF FREIGHT—

Basalt plaster, Basalt Plaster Co., Des Moines..... 1894 240

Bottlers, second-hand, Gottstein, F., v. Inspection Bureau..... 1892 847

Bottles, empty, returned, T. W. Rogers for Iowa Bottlers' association..... 1894 305

Capacity of cars, France, H. O., Rose Hill, v. C. R. I. &amp; P..... 1897 135

Coal, Keefe Coal Co., Ft. Dodge, v. Ill. Cent..... 1896 168

Corn planters, K. D..... 1890 957

Crackers, Shaver &amp; Dows, Cedar Rapids, v. Joint Western Classification..... 1883 659

Crushed stone for road purposes..... 1894 359

Discrimination in, Westphal, Hinds &amp; Co., Dubuque, v. B. C. R. &amp; N..... 1881 125

Discrimination in classification of flour, Crystal Mill and Grain Co., Council

Bluffs, v. Iowa Pool Lines..... 1883 703

Dog skins, Herman &amp; Cowrie, Des Moines, petition for change in..... 1895 221

Drugs, Miller, W. G., Ottumwa, Iowa classification maximum not minimum..... 1896 166

Farm wagons, Star Wagon Co., Cedar Rapids, v. R'y Co's..... 1886 503

Glucose, James V. Mahoney, Sioux City..... 1894 273

Gravel and sand..... 1894 359

Hancock, John T. &amp; Son, Dubuque, v. B. C. R. &amp; N. R'y, lack of uniformity..... 1880 23

Logs, rough, Des Moines Fence Co. and Des Moines Excelsior Works et al..... 1891 782

Linseed and carbon oils in mixed car loads, application for car load rates..... 1892 844

Live stock, H. G. S. Codd, Westfield..... 1894 260

Merchandise, Hummer, George, Iowa City, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., discrimination in..... 1880 153

Minimum weights, Ketcham &amp; Johnson Co., Marshalltown, v. C. &amp; N.-W..... 1897 108

National uniform freight classification discussed..... 1887, 49; 1896 11

Of freights, commissioners'..... 1889 933

Railroad ties, J. O. Taylor, Percy..... 1894 240

Sand, Besley, L. O., Council Bluffs, v. C. B. &amp; Q., petition for restoration of

previous classification on..... 1886 247

Sand and stone..... 1894 359

Sawdust and fuel, Minesh, E. D. &amp; Co., Eagle Grove..... 1897 184

Silicon wall plaster..... 1894 359

Syrup in pails, Mendel, H., Neola, v. C. R. I. &amp; P..... 1887 759

Syrup in pails, Tucker Bros., Brooks, v. C. B. &amp; Q. R'd Co..... 1887 759

Wagons, democrat spring..... 1894 359

Western Wheeler Scraper Co., Aurora, Ill., v. road making machines..... 1894 123

Worcester &amp; Son, Des Moines, v. various lines, change of on goods in transit..... 1885 540



CLASSIFICATION OF RAILROADS—see also <i>Rates, Freight.</i>	Year	Page
A., B. and C.	1878, 54, 67; 1881	85
Milner, T. H., Iowa Falls, v. B., C. R. & N., complaint of.	1882	464
COAL, APPROPRIATION OF BY BARRIERS—see <i>Appropriation of Coal.</i>		
COAL HOUSE SITES—see <i>Sites.</i>		
COAL, MINIMUM WEIGHT OF IN CAR LOADS—see <i>Minimum Weight.</i>		
Stewart, James, et al., v. C. & N.-W., scarcity of.	1882	442
COAL RATES—see <i>Rates.</i>		
PETITION FOR ADVANCE IN—see <i>Rates.</i>		
For distance less than five miles.	1890	903-922
CLEANING GRAIN IN TRANSIT—see <i>Milling in Transit.</i>		
COFFIN, L. S., paper on automatic couplers and brakes.	1887, 50; 1889	47
CONCESSIONS TO LARGE SHIPPERS—see <i>Car Load Rates.</i>		
COMMISSIONERS—AUTHORITY, POWERS AND DUTIES OF—		
To act, when in doubt, should not be exercised.	1889	1092
Derived from statute, beyond its expressed provisions they cannot act.	1889	1092
Have no authority to require crossings where no highway has been established as required by law.	1893	262
To stop the running of trains in cases of unsafe condition of road.	1892	769
No authority to interpret the law differently from its plain reading.	1892	845
May order additional train service—see also <i>Train Service.</i>	1891	806
To order freight transfer for L. C. L. shipments.	1893	168
To order under crossings.	1892	23
Duties and jurisdiction of.	1878, 5, 17, 50, 53, 54; 1879	71
under the law of 1884.	1884	42
Increased powers of, discussion in relation to shippers to carriers.	1884	61
law giving additional power to.	1887	905
Duties of, enlarged by legislature.	1892	24
Jurisdiction of.	1861 28, 862; 1892	25
Old and new laws compared.	1892 21, 39	
Duties and powers discussed.	1894	199
Duties and powers as defined by United States supreme court.	1888	31
Laws of 1888, granting additional power and making elective.	1892 21, 39	
Decisions of, enforced in courts.	1878	52
In different states.	1897 242, 243	
Expenses of boards of railroad commissioners, by states.	1878	57
In Great Britain.	1878	3
Original organization of.	1881	3
COMMISSIONERS—		
Anderson, A. B.,		
appointed.	1881	3
term expired.	1884	3
Campbell, Frank T.,		
appointed.	1888	3
elected.	1889	3
drew three years term by lot.	1889	4
term expired.	1892	3
Carpenter, C. O.,		
appointed.	1878	3
resigned.	1879	3
Coffin, L. S.,		
appointed.	1882	3
reappointed.	1885	3
term expired.	1888	3
Dawson, E. A.,		
appointed to fill vacancy.	1896	12
elected.	1897	12

## COMMISSIONERS—Continued—

	Year	Page
Dey, Peter A.,		
appointed.	1878	3
reappointed.	1886	3
elected.	1889	3
drew two years' term by lot.	1889	4
term expired.	1891	3
re-elected.	1892	3
term expired.	1895	1v
Luke, John W.,		
elected.	1891	3
re-elected.	1894	3
deceased, memorial statement.	1895, 1; 1896	12
Mowry, W.,		
elected.	1899	15
McDill, J. W.,		
appointed.	1878	3
resigned.	1881	3
reappointed.	1884	3
term expired.	1887	3
Palmer, D. J.,		
elected.	1899	15
Perkins, George W.,		
elected.	1893	3
re-elected.	1896	12
Smith, Spencer,		
appointed.	1887	3
elected.	1889	3
drew one year term by lot.	1889	4
re-elected.	1890	3
term expired.	1893	3
Wilson, James,		
appointed.	1882	3
resigned.	1883	3
Woodruff, M. C.,		
appointed.	1878	3
term expired.	1883	3
COMBINATIONS BETWEEN TRUNK LINES AND FEEDERS—see <i>Pro-rating.</i>		
COMMERCE, INTERSTATE—see <i>Interstate Commerce.</i>		
COMMON CARRIERS, must not discriminate in favor of themselves as private merchants.	1889	1046
COMMUTATION TICKETS—see <i>Passenger Fare.</i>		
COMPARATIVE TONNAGE, in carloads and less than carloads.	1883	32
COMPETITION, its effects on rates.	1886	34
CONCEALMENT IN RAILROAD AFFAIRS—see <i>Publicity.</i>		
CONDITIONS OF ROADS, improved physical.	1891	25
CONDITION OF WESTERN RAILROADS—see <i>Railroad Situation, etc.</i>		
Amount of business offered railroads.	1891	4
CONFLICTING AND DISPUTED PROVISIONS OF THE LAW—see <i>Law.</i>		
CONNECTION, CROSSINGS, discussion of.	1884	79
CONSIDERATION, TAXES VOTED FOR RAILROADS, A PART OF—see <i>Stations.</i>		
CONSIDERATION OF IOWA RAILROADS, discussed.	1879	69
CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS—		
Cannot be maintained where company has no road in operation.	1893	136
Commissioners no authority to compel the railroad companies to exercise.	1893	191
Duty of carrier to exercise in certain cases.	1891	823
Law granting for depot purposes.	1884	86
Right to exercise not included in right of eminent domain.	1887	679
Applications for—		
Algona, by Iowa Central.	1899	44
Charles City, Cedar Falls & Minnesota Rd. Co. v. land owners.	1896	15
Cedar Rapids, C. & N.-W. and B., C. R. & N. Rys. v. land owners.	1896	24
Davenport, by C., R. I. & P.	1898	77



## CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS—Applications for—Continued—

Des Moines, C. B. & Q. R'd Co. v. Thomas Goughan, Sr., et al.	1885	549
Des Moines, C. B. & Q. R'd Co. v. certain land owners	1891	767
Des Moines, Des Moines & Kansas City R'd Co.	1884	600
Dixon, R. C. B. & N. Ry. Co. v. G. W. King, et al.	1886	430
Dubuque, Union Depot company of	1895	146, 221
Ehler, Dubuque & Sioux City R'd Co. v. certain land owners	1896	63
Elidridge Junction, by C. M. & St. P.	1869	37
Estherville, by B. C. R. & N.	1891	798
Evanston, Mason City & Ft. Dodge v. certain land owners	1884	548
Garner, Finch & Hayward of, inquiries concerning	1890	947
Goss Lake, C. & N.-W. R'y Co. v. certain property owners	1898	52
Iowa City, by C. R. I. & P. R'y Co.	1887	738
Maqueta, Chicago, Santa Fe & California R'y Co. v. John Yager et al.	1899	45
Manson, by C. R. I. & P.	1895, 186	35
Oelwein, for tracks to shops of C. G. W. R'y Co.	1888	709
Onawa, Cherokee & Dakota R'd Co. v. certain land owners	1888	708
Oto, Cherokee & Dakota R'd Co. v. certain land owners	1888	23
Osceloa, Des Moines & Kansas City R'd Co. v. land owners	1896	27
Osceloa, C. B. & Q. R'd Co.	1888	672
Oskaloosa, Cent. Iowa R'y v. Baldwin, Mary, et al.	1897	45
Oskaloosa, on Iowa Central	1884	602
Ottumwa, C. M. & St. P. R'y Co. v. Daniel and Bridget Sughrue	1887	699
Ottumwa, for union depot at	1888	688
Sheldon, Cherokee & Dakota v. certain land owners	1893	135
Sioux City, Sioux City, Chicago & Baltimore R'y Co. v. certain land owners	1899	38
Vinton, by B. C. R. & N.	1890	891
Waterloo, Dub. & S. C. R'd Co. v. Waterloo Water Co. et al., petition in	1890	593
Waterloo, Dub. & S. C. R'd Co. v. certain land owners	1896	31
Waverly, by Waverly Short Line	1898	31
West Liberty, by C. R. I. & P.	1899	43

## CONTRACT—

Road work by	1891	26
Quotation of rates by agent and acceptance thereof constitutes	1888	609
For exemption of liability from fire et by engines	1895	xxxv
Concerning contract of release from liability by fire caused by railway company	1897	155

## CONTRACT, VIOLATION OF—

Berry, W. T., Marshalltown, v. W. I. & N., in providing crossing	1885	557
Davidson, M., Plano, v. Wabash, in building side track, etc.	1892	841
Day, F. A., Castana, v. Maple River R'd Co., in location of railroad	1884	545
Dorcas, John, Shiloh, v. C. & N.-W. R'y, failure to construct side track	1886	573
Elliott, W. P., Morning Sun, v. B. C. R. & N., failure to fence	1883	729
Fausner, W. D., Wirt, v. H. & S., violation of right of way contract	1887	682
Fort Dodge, city of, v. C. R. I. & P. et al., failure to operate road	1889	983, 987
Harshbarger, W. A., Oakland Mills, v. St. L., K. & N. W., failure to provide crossings and fence in consideration of right of way	1892	841
Hunter, A., Wyman, v. B. & N. W., failure to build cattle guards, fences, etc.	1883	705
Kenyon, F. L. et al., Iowa City, v. B. C. R. & N., failure to put in chain car	1883	671
Macrae, D., mayor of Council Bluffs, v. C. R. I. & P. and C. & N.-W., in abandoning Council Bluffs as western terminus	1892	845
Orilla, citizens of, v. C. G. W., in maintaining station	1894	238
Phelan, James, Matland, Dak., v. C. M. & St. P. R'y Co., failure to furnish shipping facilities	1885	512
Seever, W. A., et al., Oskaloosa, v. Central Iowa, station accommodations	1888	590
Springer, A., Prairie City, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to redeem commutation tickets	1885	580
Torkelson, Nels et al., Austin, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to put in station	1892	863
Yaggy, E. H., Audubon, v. B. C. R. & N., on rates on emigrant movables	1885	583

## CONVENTION OF STATE RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS—

With Interstate Commerce commission	11
.....1889, 19; 1891, 30-39; 1892, 44; 1893, 404; 1894, 361; 1895, xxxviii; 1895, 10; 1897	164
With commissioners of surrounding states	1891

COOLEY, JUDGE T. M., on "Railroad Commissions"	1882	45
Address on "The Railway Problem"	1891	89
Article on "Popular and Legal Views of Traffic Pooling"	1887	34
CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNTS, open discussed	1878	38-39
CONTROL OF RAILROADS BY GOVERNMENT—see Government Control.		
CONTROL BY STATE—see State Control.		
CONTROL OF STATION GROUNDS—see Omnibus Privileges.		
CONVENTION RATES—see Rates.		
CORN RATES, request of commissioners for temporary reduction of	1886	619
COST—		
Average of roads in different states	1880	175
Difficulty in obtaining information on	1884	17
Discussion on	1887	51
Earnings of, in excess of 8 per cent on \$50,000 per mile	1891	86, 97
Of construction per mile	1878	35
Of equipment per mile	1878	36
To move freight, per ton per mile, discussed	1884, 20;	1888 764-768
OR OVER AND UNDER RAILROAD CROSSINGS, APPORTIONMENT OF—see Crossings.		
COUPLERS—AUTOMATIC—AND BRAKES—see also Automatic Couplers.		
Automatic, paper on, by Commissioner Coffin	1885, 92; 1887, 59;	1889 47
Comparative table, 1878-1899	1890	13
Different types of couplers considered	1891	20, 25
Discussion of Iowa law requiring their use	1890	7
Law concerning	1891	18-
Recommendations of commissioners' convention for law concerning	1892	46
Test of, in Massachusetts, reported	1884	40
Generally used	1898	4
COUPLING CARS—		
Loss of life and personal injury discussed	1884	39
COURTS, CASES PENDING IN. REPORT OF ATTORNEY-GENERAL—see Litigation.		
State courts to take cognizance of order of commissioners	1891	863
CROSSINGS, FARM—		
At grade, and over or under grade, discussed	1893	18, 25
Decision of supreme court regarding	1892	23, 28
Stratons of public right decision by supreme court	1892	28
Overhead farm crossing, decision of supreme court	1892	28, 29
Legislation recommended	1889, 48; 1891, 43;	1899 7
COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—PETITIONS FOR—		
Amundson, Helga, Ellsworth, v. C. & N.-W., obstructed by snow	1888	738
Anderson, W. M., St. Charles, v. D. M. & K. C., at grade	1897	23
Barnes, R. H. and J. H., Olivet, v. C. R. I. & P., under, open	1893	261
Beck, Joseph, Marcus, v. C. & S. C. (Ill. Cent.), under	1891	825
Berry, W. T., Marshalltown, v. W. I. & N., contract for violated	1885	557
Berry, W. T., Marshalltown, v. C. G. W., under crossing	1895	164
Blackman, G. M., Newton, v. C. R. I. & P., at grade, farm	1890	909
Brookman, William, Baxter, v. C. St. P. & K. C., open farm	1890	912
Brownell, H. S., Spirit Lake, v. C. M. & St. P., open—cattle guard	1892	845
Burns, Thomas, Breda, v. C. & N.-W., at grade	1883	690
Cain, Dennis, Arthur, v. C. & N.-W., negotiable	1888	729
Chapman, H., Sioux City, v. C. M. & St. P., location of	1890	846
Cole, Lyman, v. B. C. R. & N., under, petition for	1896	167
Cruze, J. B., Vincennes, v. C. R. I. & P., renewal of bridge	1899	63
Cunningham & Jones, Marshalltown, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for	1892	830
Cuttsfield, J. W., Lucas, v. C. B. & Q., ordinary	1895	185
Cutler, G. L., Clarion, v. M. C. & Ft. D., open and cattle guards	1897	716
Cutler, G. L., Clarion, v. M. C. & Ft. D., under farm	1890	1069
Cutler, G. L., Clarion, v. M. C. & Ft. D., petition for under	1890	850
Cutler, G. L.	1893	83
Davies, J. K., Bagley, v. C. M. & St. P., open	1898	76
Davitt, James, Cummings, v. C. G. W., under	1895	125
Denison, T. W., Clarion, v. M. C. & Ft. D., replacing and repairing farm crossing	1896	52



## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—Petitions for—Continued—

	Year	Page
Dennis, I. V., Coralville, v. C. R. I. & P., under, failure to maintain.....	1889	979
Deluhery, T., Sumner, v. M. & N. W., farm and cattle guards.....	1886	596
Eckstein, H. et al., Cresco, v. C. M. & St. P., open.....	1895	202
Ennessy, P., New Hampton, v. C. St. P. & K. C., petition for under.....	1889	1073
Ennessy, P., New Hampton, v. C. G. W., defective under bridge.....	1893	167
Fanser, W. D., Wirt, v. H. & S., contract providing, ignored.....	1887	682
Fisher, R. B., Knoxville, v. C. R. I. & P., overhead.....	1882	420
Fordyce, Harry, Libertyville, v. C. R. I. & P., petition for farm.....	1886	609
Fuller, H. E., Kalo, v. M. & St. L., petition for farm.....	1885	563
George, W. C., Collins, v. C. M. & St. P., undergrade cattle pass.....	1899	88
Gaston, H. F., Traer, v. I. M. & N. W., undergrade.....	1899	118
Glays, J., Libertyville, v. C. Ft. M. & D. M., petition as per contract.....	1893	237
Gravatt, O., Traer, v. C. & N. W. R'y, undergrade.....	1899	113
Graves, R. T., Mason City, v. M. C. & Ft. D., under.....	1895	38
Gray, W. A., Albia, v. Iowa Cent. R'y, at grade.....	1899	69
Hamilton, William R., Washington, v. C. R. I. & P., under bridge.....	1893	145
Hanke, August, Wall Lake, v. C. & N. W., petition for open.....	1886	499-552
Heavilin, S. R., Gladbrook, v. C. G. W., replacing.....	1897	122
Helm, M. F., Mechanicsville, v. C. & N. W., repairs on.....	1894	274
Hickman, C. J., Metz, v. C. R. I. & P., petition to restore plank in.....	1891	760
Hickman, C. J., Metz, v. C. R. I. & P., defective farm.....	1892	553
Hoover, C. E., Delphos, v. C. B. & Q., under and cattle guard.....	1889	1004
Hopkins, David, Panora, v. D. M. N. & W., petition for under.....	1893	225
Humphrey, Sanford, Jefferson county, v. C. R. I. & P., protest against filling crossing under bridge.....	1893	207
Ives, Julius, Dickens, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for open.....	1889	1063
Jarvis, Myers, Morning Sun, v. Iowa Cent., cattle guards and fencing.....	1895	153
Kendall, J. F., Fredericksburg, v. C. G. W., undergrade.....	1898	89
Kiel, De Kalb, v. H. & S., petition for farm.....	1892	831
Korns, Jacob, Hartwick, v. C. & N. W., under, failure to repair.....	1891	730
Lemen, J. H., Colfax, v. C. R. I. & P., ordinary, at grade.....	1895	188
Lewis, J. F., New Hampton, v. C. G. W., petition for open farm.....	1893	203
Lister, William, Newton, v. C. R. I. & P., petition for open.....	1889	1032
Lockwood, L. N., Coldwater, v. I. M. & N. W., undergrade.....	1899	104
Lynch, P., New Hampton, v. C. St. P. & K. C., undergrade.....	1888, 701; 1889, 978; 1899	89
Lyons, P., Navan, v. C. M. & St. P., undergrade.....	1899	64
Madsen, C. et al., Cresco, v. C. M. & St. P., open.....	1895	202
Martin, J. H., Tripoli, v. C. St. P. & K. C., protest against removing.....	1890	572
Martin, J., Bagley, v. C. M. & St. P., with cattle guards.....	1898	50
Meyer, Arend, Holland, v. B. C. R. & N., undergrade.....	1897	70
Miller, James T., Bristow, v. Dub. & Dak., impassable condition of.....	1886	501
Morrison, D., Arthur, v. C. & N. W., petition to repair under.....	1891	791
McDonald, Thomas, Bayard, v. C. M. & St. P., overhead farm.....	1886, 587; 1889	975
McDonald, Thomas, Bayard, v. C. M. & St. P., board's decision discussed.....	1892	28
Supreme court's opinion in.....	1892	893
Norton, B. P., Cresco, v. C. M. & St. P., board's decision discussed.....	1890	916
Overholt, E. S., Wyoming, v. C. & N. W., petition for under.....	1893	213
Pease, John, Farragut, v. C. B. & Q., petition for reopening farm.....	1893	222
Peeke, J. W., Truro, v. D. M. & K. C., open.....	1895	193
Phipps, A. S., Farragut, v. C. B. & Q., open.....	1898	15
Pine, N. A., Algona, v. C. M. & St. P., undergrade.....	1898	48
Poorbaugh, H., Colfax, v. C. R. I. & P., at grade.....	1896	119
Plato, O., for A. Bartlett, Correctionville, v. Ill. Cent., open crossing.....	1896	139
Pryor, A. M., Leon, v. D. M. & K. C., petition for farm.....	1891	812
Ryan, R. B., Leighton, v. C. R. I. & P., over.....	1894	240
Scanlon, Thomas, Grafton, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for farm.....	1892	845
Schade, Conrad, Glenwood, v. C. B. & Q., petition to leave, under bridge.....	1892	856
Schrimer, Mrs. F., Linn Junction, v. C. M. & St. P., undergrade.....	1897	120
Smith, J. H., Ira, v. C. G. W., petition to open farm crossing as per contract.....	1893	231
Smith, E. C., Crown, v. C. B. & Q., petition for under farm.....	1892	823
Stanton, Franklin, Shenandoah, v. C. & St. L., dangerous.....	1898	75

## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—Petitions for—Continued—

	Year	Page
Stephens, A. C., Gildred, v. C. & N. W., petition for open farm.....	1888	728
Swain, J. W., Guthrie county, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for under.....	1893	241
Swisher, J. D. W., Sigourney, v. C. R. I. & P., over.....	1885, 115; 1897	17
Tunncliffe, G. and O., Bingham, v. O. & St. L., petition for open.....	1893	214
Wakeman, M. A., Otho, v. M. & St. L., taking up plank.....	1896	106
Wallace, S. M., Shambaugh, v. C. B. & Q., petition for open.....	1892	766
Walters, H. F., Rockwell City, v. Ill. Cent., undergrade.....	1899	91
Warfel, B. F., Washington, v. C. R. I. & P., under, for stock.....	1895	237
Welday, James, Fairfield, v. C. Ft. M. & D. M., open.....	1895	141
Warnock, Alexander, Sigourney, v. B. C. R. & N., petition for under.....	1892	807
Warnock, Alexander, case, petition for under.....	1893	18
Warnock, Alexander, Sigourney, v. B. C. R. & N. (test case), in court.....	1893	171
Warnock, Alexander, Sigourney, attorney-general's report concerning.....	1895 xxxviii	
Warnock, Alexander, Sigourney, supreme court's opinion or discussion of.....	1896	5
White, Dr. S. S., Creston, v. C. B. & Q., protest against filling under bridge.....	1893	218
Willson, Isaac, Henderson, v. C. B. & Q., open.....	1898	63
Zurcher, Farmersburg, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for under.....	1891	770
CROSSINGS, HIGHWAY—		
At grade, their construction over station grounds discussed.....	1893	16-156
Expense of relocation must be borne by railroad company, opinion by attorney-general.....	1889	1065
Discussion of.....	1890, 10; 1896, 7; 1899	7
Legislation recommended.....	1885, 60; 1890, 39; 1901	44
Jurisdiction of commission in ordering.....	1894, 173; 1898	7
Should railway companies grade full width on right of way?.....	1895	195
Number in Iowa.....	1893	1
PETITIONS FOR, COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—		
Adams, R. M., road supervisor, Clarke county, v. C. B. & Q.....	1891	729
Anderson, William M., St. Charles, v. D. M. & K. C., alley.....	1897	23
Anderson, Frank, Dawson, v. C. M. & St. P., concerning rights of county.....	1898	64
Arcadia, town of, v. C. & N. W., opening street.....	1892	38
Bargfriede, William et al., Arcadia, v. C. & N. W., street crossing.....	1897	847
Binford, J. D., Allen's Grove, v. C. M. & St. P., unsafe condition of.....	1886	555
Boatwright, G. J., Hastie, v. Wabash, petition for reopening of.....	1892	897
Buckley, D., New Hampton, v. C. G. W., unfit condition of.....	1898	77
Brooks, M. et al., v. C. & N. W., dangerous.....	1894	344
Bryan, J. C., Bouton, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1890	950
Buena Vista county v. C. & N. W., opening crossing.....	1899	61
Burch, A. M., road supervisor, Dixon, v. B. C. R. & N., defective.....	1889	1031
Carpenter, for board of supervisors, Iowa Falls, v. Ill. Cent., petition for.....	1896	68
Cedar county, supervisors of, v. B. C. R. & N., dangerous.....	1899	52
Cedar Rapids, township trustees of, v. C. M. & St. P., dangerous.....	1899	93
Center township, Mills county, v. C. B. & Q., dangerous condition of.....	1885	578
Clark, J. S., Davis City, v. C. B. & Q., opening street across right of way.....	1892	832
Coffin, L. S., v. Ill. Cent. and M. & St. L., dangerous at Ft. Dodge.....	1893	713
Comstock, J. L. et al., Hardy, v. B. C. R. & N., petition for street crossing.....	1896	132
Cordell, J. L., road supervisor, Boone, v. D. M. N. & W., petition for.....	1893	227
Corsant, Benjamin et al., Bagley, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1893	208
Corwith, citizens of, v. M. & St. L., petition for.....	1896	592
Crawford, M. A., Glard, v. C. M. & St. L., failure to plank.....	1897	148
Davis, George W., mayor of Hastings, v. C. B. & Q., for flagman at.....	1892	831
Davis, L. B., Bridgewater, v. C. B. & Q., petition for.....	1894	311
Dicker, F. E., Correctionville, v. C. & N. W., relocation of highway.....	1891	799
Dodd, Andrew, Traer, v. B. C. R. & N.....	1892	528
Elkport, town of, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to plank.....	1897	143
Felton, J. B., supervisor, New Virginia, v. D. M. & K. C., defective.....	1892	789
Ferguson, W. P., county attorney, Page county, Shenandoah, for board of supervisors, v. C. B. & Q., petition for highway crossings.....	1893, 232; 1894	172
Fort Dodge, city of, v. C. R. I. & P. and M. & St. L., overhead, street.....	1892	609
Francis, P. H., Cedar Rapids, inquiry as to duty of railway company as to grade.....	1895	195
Frantz, S. G., Blairtown, v. C. & N. W., petition for.....	1894	315



## CROSSINGS, HIGHWAY—Continued—

	Year	Page
French, D. A., road supervisor, Rowan, v. B. C. R. & N., petition for.....	1892	854
Funk, J. H., Iowa Falls, v. Ill. Cent., dangerous and dark street crossing.....	1896	59
Gafford, Joseph, Burlington, v. citizens of Murray, dangerous obstruction.....	1887	687
Graff, N. H., v. C. & N.-W., dangerous street crossing.....	1896	128
Haviland, D. A., Ft. Dodge, v. M. & St. L. and Ill. Cent., dangerous.....	1886	509
Hersom, H., Diagonal, v. A. & S., highway.....	1894	251
Hill & Hall, Wesley, v. C. R. & G. & N.-W., street crossing in Titonka.....	1899	110
Hutchinson, attorney for Sioux county supervisors, v. C. & N.-W., undergrade.....	1896	71
Hutchinson, attorney for Sioux county, near Maurice.....	1897	59
Independence township, Jasper county, trustees of, v. W., I. & N., unsafe.....	1885	543
Johnson, H., Casey, v. C. R. I. & P., petition for.....	1895	165
Jost, F. J., mayor of Remsen, v. Ill. Cent., defective, street.....	1892	839
Keep, Fred A., Rock Rapids, v. C. M. & St. P., dangerous highway.....	1884	596
Kendig, B. F., road supervisor, Centerville, v. Iowa Cent. R'y, undergrade.....	1898	78
Kincaid, A. W., Mt. Pleasant, v. St. L., K. & N.-W., overhead, defective.....	1880	1085
Lamotte, trustees of, v. C. & N.-W., unfit condition of.....	1896	170
Latham, Fred, Ft. Dodge, v. Ill. Cent. et al., obstructing view of.....	1890	847
Laubach, H., Goldfield, v. C. & N.-W., highway.....	1894	254
Louisa county supervisors v. Iowa Cent. et al., undergrade.....	1896	34
Lestina, road supervisors, Froelich, v. C. M. & St. P., overflow of.....	1897	119
Long Creek township, Van Wert, v. H. & S., overhead, too low.....	1897	124
Luther, O. D., road supervisor, Marcus, v. Ill. Cent., grading road crossing.....	1893	245
Marshall county, supervisors of, v. C. & N.-W., petition for new highway cross- ing on relocation of highway.....	1889	1064
Meyers, N. W., Lamotte, v. C. & N.-W., condition of approaches.....	1896	160
McGregor, city of, v. C. M. & St. P., over-crossing on highway.....	1889	1009
McKimpson, L., Thayer, v. C. B. & Q., petition for.....	1897	112
Merritt, George H., Glidden, v. O. & N.-W., refusal to put in.....	1885	569
Mitchellville v. C. B. I. & P., street across station grounds.....	1894	358
Molsberry, M. A., Clarksville, v. B. C. R. & N., highway crossing.....	1896	129
Moon, C. H., Ackworth, v. C. B. & Q., dangerous approach to.....	1889	1047
Moralee, C., Allison, v. O. St. P. & K. C., petition for two highways.....	1891	817
Mouw, B., et al., Sioux Center, v. S. C. & N., dangerous.....	1895	110
Murray, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., obstruction of view at highway.....	1896	565
Nagle, Conrad, supervisor, Odebolt, v. C. & N.-W., defective highway.....	1892	827
Neola v. C. R. I. & P. and C. M. & St. P., overhead street crossings.....	1892	806
Nicholas, James, road supervisor, Hamilton township, Iowa county, v. C. M. & St. P., dangerous crossing near highway, Williamsburg.....	1891	795
Page county, supervisor of, v. C. B. & Q., jurisdiction of commissioners in estab- lishing highway crossings.....	1894	172
Poffinberger, A., Marshall county, v. C. G. W. R'y, highway.....	1893	202
Polk county, citizens of, v. C. St. P. & K. C., protest against dangerous.....	1887	718
Portland township, Algona, v. C. & N.-W., petition for.....	1894	261
Pottawattamie county, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., better approaches to.....	1892	786
Pottawattamie county v. O. & St. L., petition to repair.....	1893	205
Pundi, F., Iowa county, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1893, 290;	1894 314
Raymond, J. C., Algona, v. B. C. R. & N., opening of.....	1897	51
Raymond, J. C., Algona, v. C. & N.-W., failure to open.....	1898	71-76
Raymond & Raymond, Algona, v. B. C. R. & N., at grade.....	1893	64
Redmond, J. M., Cedar Rapids, v. C. & N.-W., electric signal for.....	1893	137-138
Rockwell City, incorporated town of, v. D. M. N. & W., street crossing.....	1898	47
Rogers, F. B., et al., Britt, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1886	529
Rogers, H. A., Boone, v. C. & N.-W., petition for.....	1887	777
Ruehle, Charles, Ruthven, v. C. R. I. & P., repairs on, drainage, etc.....	1894	303
Russell, John W., et al., Kilduff, v. Central Iowa, petition for.....	1884	527
Ruthven, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., over station grounds.....	1886	561
Schooler, Peter, Sumner, v. C. R. I. & P., petition for highway crossing.....	1886	590
Simpson, J. H., Rock Valley, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1895	225
Sprague, J. F., Russell, v. C. B. & Q., complaint should show what street.....	1898	42
Steamboat Rock, citizens of, v. Ia. C. O., street crossing at grade.....	1896	32
Thomas, A. D., Fredericksburg, v. C. G. W., across station grounds.....	1898	156

## CROSSINGS, HIGHWAY—Continued—

	Year	Page
Titonka, on C. R. G. & N.-W., opening street in.....	1899	110
Turner, John, supervisor, Lenox, v. C. B. Q., petition for.....	1892	835
Union township, Boone county, trustees of, v. M. & St. L., defective.....	1886	584
Vincent, Leon, et al., Fort Dodge, v. S. C. O. (Ill. Cent.) overhead.....	1893	148
Walnut, township trustees of, C. R. I. & P., overhead.....	1899	54
Wells, L., township clerk, Mallard, v. C. R. I. & P., petition for.....	1892	801
Woodford, S. C., road supervisor, Clay, v. Ia. Cent., petition for.....	1895	148
Yates, William, Glidden, v. C. & N.-W., petition for and cattle guard.....	1884	563
Zenor, W. H., road supervisor, Ontario, v. C. & N.-W., petition for.....	1891	320

CROSSINGS AT STATION GROUNDS—see *Obstruction*; also *Crossings, Highway*.CROSSINGS BLOCKADED BY TRAINS—see *Obstructing Streets*.CROSSING, STREET, BLOCKADED WITH TRAINS—see *Obstruction*.

## CROSSING STOPS—

Adel, citizens of, v. D. M. & Ft. D., failure to let passengers off.....	1882	558
Altoona, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., failure to stop at intersection.....	1894	181
Bennett, L. D., Mason City, v. B. C. R. & N., failure to stop.....	1892	855
Boyd, J. I., Herndon, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to stop.....	1894	595
Carr, C. W., et al., Dow City, v. C. & N.-W., failure to stop at Arlon.....	1894	330
Doughty, B. F., and C. W. Carr, Dow City, v. C. & N.-W., failure to stop.....	1894	330
Dunsmore, N., Rockwell, v. Central Iowa, failure to stop.....	1882	529
Foster, W. J., Clarksville, v. B. C. R. & N. Ry., failure to stop.....	1894	546
Requirement concerning stopping of trains at.....	1894	85

## CROSSING—RAILROAD.

Adequate, should be defined by legislative enactment.....	1892	29
At grade, dangerous.....	1892	28
At grade, discussed.....	1888, 23;	1899 11
At grade, laws of various states concerning.....	1887	711
Connection at grade.....	1894	79
Intersecting.....	1894	78
Crossing over railroad, what constitutes "an adequate crossing".....	1893	23
Requirements concerning stopping of trains at.....	1894	85

## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING.

C. Ft. M. & D. M. R. R. Co., v. C. B. & Q. and St. L., K. & N.-W., petition for grade.....	1890	926
C. & N.-W. R'y Co. v. S. C. & N., protest against grade at Maurice.....	1889	1014
C. R. I. & P. R'y Co. v. C. St. P. & K. C., at grade.....	1887	735
C. R. I. & P. R'y Co. v. F. M. & D. M., at grade at Libertyville.....	1892	743
C. R. I. & P. v. D. I. & D. R. R. Co., in Muscatine county.....	1889	829
Humeston & Shen, R. R. Co., v. C. St. P. & K. C., at grade.....	1887	709
Ill. Cent. and Cgd. Falls & Minn. v. Waverly Short Line, et al., at grade.....	1886	576
Ill. Cent. R'd Co. v. C. M. & St. P., at Storm Lake.....	1899	161
Ill. Cent. R'd Co. v. C. M. & St. P., at Arlon.....	1899	162
Lake Manawa R'y Co. v. O. R. I. & P. et al., at grade in city.....	1887	729
Law requiring, discussed.....	1884	58
Mason City & Ft. Dodge R. R. Co. v. Crooked Creek R'y Co., at grade.....	1887	732
Sutherland and Paullina, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W. et al., at grade.....	1887	754
Webster City & C. O. R. R. Co. v. M. C. & Ft. D., arbitration.....	1886, 598,	601
CULLOM INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE from United States senate.....	1885	32

DAMAGES TO PROPERTY when shipped at owner's risk, company not liable when less rate is given in consideration of such release..... 1890 878

—see, also, *Owner's Risk*.DAMAGES RESULTING FROM FAILURE TO RECEIVE CARS FOR SHIPMENTS—see *Failure to furnish cars*.DAMAGES FROM FIRE SET BY ENGINE—see, also, *Fire set by engine*.

## DAMAGES.

Allee, S. R., Lynneville, v. Iowa Cent., delay in handling poultry.....	1891	769
Ashburn, J. M., Lamoni, v. C. B. & Q., delay in furnishing car for stock.....	1889	989
Axman, John, Dedham, v. C. M. & St. P., neglect of stock in transit.....	1889	1049
Ayers & Co., Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., goods broken interstate.....	1882	415
Babcock, G. E., Ft. Dodge, v. D. M. & F. D., for right of way.....	1885, 543;	1886 523
Bangs, A. A., Dows, v. C. St. P., M. & O. and C. & N.-W., delay in transit.....	1891	775



## DAMAGES—Continued—

	Year	Page
Bazeley, B. Paullina, v. C. & N.-W., claim for additional right of way.....	1887	702
Beach, A. B., Pattersonville, v. C. M. & St. P., delay of agricultural implements.....	1884	508
Beck, M., Marcus, v. Ill. Cent., butter, lack of refrigerator car.....	1893	202
Beeson, R. B., Pattersonville, v. B., C. R. & N. et al., delay of live stock.....	1883	726
Benedict, George, Maxwell, v. C. M. & St. P., to goods in transit.....	1882	553
Block, M., Des Moines, v. C. & N.-W., delay in forwarding sample trunk.....	1892	853
Bond, N. J., Council Bluffs, v. Wabash, failure to furnish cars.....	1882	451
Bousquet, H. F., Pella, v. C. R. I. & P., to goods in transit.....	1882	535
Brodsky, L., Plover, v. C., R. I. & P., to hay in transit on account of delay.....	1889	1080
Brown, G. H., Pilot Mound, v. M. & St. L., failure to fence.....	1884	499
Brown, H. C., Dumont, v. C. G. W., live stock killed in transit, claim for.....	1893	207
Brown, W. R., Wallingford, v. C. M. & St. P. Ry., delay of live stock.....	1883	687
Bulla & Hammer, Macedonia, v. C. M. & Rt. P., delay in delivery.....	1883	620
Butz Bros. & Co., Des Moines, v. C., B. & Q., delay of fruit in transit.....	1886	491
Campbell, Daniel, Blenco, v. S. C. & P. and C. & N.-W., owner's risk.....	1882	465
Cassady & Whitney, Whiting, v. C. & N.-W., death of hogs in transit.....	1887	765
Childs, H. A., Lenox, v. C., B. & Q., to goods in transit.....	1887	762
Chaplin, W. E., Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., carried past station.....	1887	759
Chantland, Thomas, Badger, v. C. R. I. & P., delay of live stock.....	1885	531
Clark, Rev. S. F., Nassau, v. B., C. R. & N., ejectment from train.....	1887	696
Currier, J. P., Melrose, v. C., B. & Q., delay of grain in transit.....	1883	587
Outler & Lindon, Rockford, v. B. O. R. & N., delay in transit.....	1883	665
Doyle, Charles T., Panora, v. C. & N.-W., delay of household goods.....	1883	638
Duffus & Corrough, Malcom, v. C. R. I. & P., goods broken in transit.....	1891	739
Earle, W. C., Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., delay in handling live stock.....	1883	719
Eaton, M. W., Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., delay of live stock in transit.....	1886	555
Eaton, M. W., Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., to live stock in transit.....	1887	741
Flanders, M. D., Hamilton, v. C., B. & Q., breakage of machinery in transit.....	1889	1044
Glover, H. B. & Co., Dubuque, v. B., C. R. & N., delay in shipping goods.....	1883	692
Goodwin, Mrs. P., Traer, v. C. R. I. & P., delay and detention of baggage.....	1883	645
Hall, James, Milo, v. C., B. & Q., burning of hedge by section men.....	1883	653
Hanger, J. et al., Sac City, v. C. & N.-W., changing grade of side track.....	1890	923
Hanna, J. Q., Goldfield, v. C. & N.-W., violation of right of way contract.....	1882	422
Harris, H. W., Perry, v. D. M. & Ft. D., stock killed on highway crossing.....	1883	694
Haskins, A. N., Estherville, v. B., C. R. & N., fire from locomotive.....	1883	541
Helzer, M. & Son, Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., damage to goods in transit.....	1892	832
Hexter, David, Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., perishable freight.....	1892	857
Hoek, C. H., Marshalltown, v. Wabash R'y Co., private claim.....	1889	1082
Hofer, L., Kearney, Keb, v. C., R. I. & P. and U. P.....	1883	731
Hoffman, M. P., Redding, v. C., B. & Q., live stock died in transit.....	1884	504
Hornaday, C. A., Unionville, v. C., R. I. & P., failure to deliver freight.....	1882	481
Hughey & Son, Wirt, v. H. & S. R. R. Co., lack of refrigerator car.....	1884	567
Hull, J. B., Ft. Dodge, v. C. & N.-W., negligence and damage.....	1881	137
Humphrey, J. M., Lovilla, v. W., St. L. & P., to live stock at highway.....	1887	697
Hutton & Durette, Randolph, v. C., B. & Q., to stock in transit.....	1882	421
Jesmer & Day, Clark, v. C. M. & St. P., delay in forwarding merchandise.....	1884	584
Johnson, S. E., Richland, v. Central Iowa and C., R. I. & P., to eggs.....	1884	543
Johnston, W. F., Toledo, v. B., C. R. & N., delay and decline in price.....	1885	554
Leech, J. F., Mt. Pleasant, concerning contract of release from liability from damage by fire.....	1897	155
Kline, Bennett, Manson, v. Ill. Cent., to coal thrown from car.....	1896	144
Majors, O. V., with Omaha Rubber Co., v. C., B. & Q., delay of baggage.....	1891	787
Maple, E. B., Olarinda, v. C., B. & Q., from fire by lightning.....	1886	560
Marshall & Son, Charlton, v. C., B. & Q., to butter, delay in transit.....	1882	497
Mathews, William R., Sully, v. Central Iowa, right of way damages.....	1887	763
McCosky, J. K., Onawa, v. S. O. & P., to stove pipe from water.....	1884	599
McCracken, O. S., Rock Valley, v. Adams Ex. Co., to books in transit.....	1892	853
McNaughton, M. N., Villisca, v. C., B. & Q., stock drowned by back water.....	1887	766
Meade, S. K., Rockwell City, v. C. & N.-W., erroneous delivery of goods.....	1892	853
Melrose, N. M., Goldfield, v. C. & N.-W., failure to deliver at station.....	1884	560
Molling, Frank, Milwaukee, v. B., C. R. & N., to goods in transit.....	1896	84

## DAMAGES—Continued—

	Year	Page
Miley, Eli, Benton, v. C. G. W., injury to stock in transit.....	1893	233
Nickson, John, Wacousta, v. C. & N.-W., to stock in transit.....	1883	574
Raff, Peter, Maxwell, v. C. M. & St. P., to goods in transit.....	1883	580
Reid, Charles, Wessington, Dak., v. B., C. R. & N., for personal injury.....	1883	579
Riche, W. S., Muscatine, v. B., C. R. & N., delay of melons in transit.....	1882	418
Richd, W. S., Muscatine, v. B., C. R. & N., erroneous delivery of oats.....	1884	507
Robinson, William, Ft. Dodge, v. Ill. Cent., damages to potatoes in transit.....	1889	1069
Royce, L., Malcolm, v. C., R. I. & P., damages to machinery in transit.....	1888	835
Runyon, A. G., Webster City, v. B., C. R. & N., expiration of excursion ticket.....	1885	565
Shanks & Coats, West Mitchell, v. C., B. & Q. et al., to perishable goods.....	1883	550
Shanks & Coats, West Mitchell, v. Central Iowa, to goods in transit, refusal of carriers to comply with board's decision.....	1884	539
Shepard Bros., Fruitland, v. C., R. I. & P., delay in forwarding melons.....	1889	1031
Sibley & Co., State Center, v. C. & N.-W., to eggs frozen in transit.....	1889	1030
Smith, C. W., Belmond, v. M. C. & Ft. D., snow drifting in car of oats.....	1888	672
Snow, E., Grinnell, v. C., R. I. & P., to goods in transit.....	1884	511
Stevens, Charles, Donnellson, v. C., R. I. & P. and C., B. & Q., potatoes frozen.....	1892	851
Sylvester & Topliff, Davis City, v. C., B. & Q., goods lost and broken.....	1892	831
Tucker & Sims, Bussey, v. C., B. & Q., to goods in transit.....	1896	136
Vorse, Frank W., Des Moines, v. Wabash, St. L. & P., goods lost.....	1883	692
Walton, Charles, Paton, v. C., R. I. & P., to merchandise in transit.....	1888	716
Walton, Charles, Paton, v. C., R. I. & P., for injury to goods in transit.....	1890	874
Wasson, J. A., Roscoe, Kan., v. C., M. & St. P., on account delay in transit.....	1883	658
Way & Pickard, Cedar Falls, v. B., C. R. & N., from failure to furnish cars.....	1883	559
Wilbur & Cook, Mt. Ayr, v. H. & S., erroneous billing, shipment mislent.....	1889	1037
Williams, V. J. & Co., Dubuque, v. C. & N.-W., to goods in transit.....	1883	628
Wilson, J. F., Jolly, v. D. M., N. & W., fire set by section men.....	1897	150
Windell, W. S., Castalia, v. C. M. & St. P., carried past station.....	1892	862
Wishard, W. H., Wellman, v. B., C. R. & N., to goods in transit.....	1893	57
Withington, H. H., Toledo, v. B., C. R. & N. and C. & N.-W., to live stock.....	1888	541
Woodman, A. J., Russell, v. C., B. & Q., to sheet iron by water.....	1884	568
Woren, H. A., Belknap, v. C., R. I. & P., in handling butter.....	1884	586
DANGEROUS CROSSINGS, ELECTRIC SIGNALS AT—see <i>Electric Signals</i> .		
DANGEROUS LOCATION OF DEPOTS—see <i>Obstruction to View of Highway Crossing</i> .		
DAYENPORT, SHIPPERS OF, COMPLAINT OF ON RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
DECREASE OF RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
DEFINITION OF SWITCH—see <i>Switch</i> .		
DELAY IN TRANSIT—see <i>Damages</i> .		
DELAY—see also <i>Damages</i> .		
Blanch, John S., Nugent, v. Ill. Cent., in delivering goods.....	1886	522
Brodsky, L., Plover, v. C., R. I. & P., damage to hay on account of delay.....	1889	1080
Butz Bros. & Co., Des Moines, v. C., B. & Q., delay in fruit shipments.....	1886	491
Cameron, W. W., Mason City, v. Central Iowa, et al., damage to live stock.....	1888	734
Campbell & Mehlman, Massena, v. C., B. & Q., in handling loaded cars.....	1889	1016
Casey & Dolan, Griswold, v. C., B. & Q., in shipment of live stock.....	1887	782
Coad, N. G. O., Hull, v. C., M. & St. P., in oil shipments.....	1896	114
Evans, A., & Co., Onawa, v. K. C., St. J. & C. B., household goods.....	1886	481
Gillette, A. H., Fort Madison, v. C. & N.-W., et al., of household goods.....	1889	1043
Great Western Fuel Co., Gilmore, v. C. & N.-W., on shipment of coal.....	1887	691
Hancock, John T. & Sons, Dubuque, v. B., C. R. & N., of merchandise in transit.....	1880	109
Hancock, John T., Dubuque, v. B., C. R. & N., delay in transit.....	1884	521
Judge, J. T., Carroll, v. C., M. & St. P., of tent in transit.....	1896	150
Kelley, J. W. & Son., Oceola, v. C., B. & Q., in handling coal.....	1885	513
Kiron & McKay, Waucoma, v. C., St. P. & K. C. and O., M. & St. P., flour.....	1892	855
McConnell, S. R. & I. C., Burlington, v. C., R. I. & P., delay transporting and delivering goods.....	1892	851
McDonald, T. B., Lovilla, v. Wabash Western, in delivery of goods.....	1888	716
Moody, H. H., Greeley, v. C., M. & St. P., on account of strike.....	1888	707
O'Neal, Felix & Co., Aurelia, v. Ill. Cent., in transit.....	1884	578
Pierce & Glass, Winfield, v. B. & N.-W., in shipment of tile.....	1899	90
Toft, K., Estherville, v. C. & N.-W., damage to live stock on account of.....	1888	750



## DELAY—(see, also, Damages)—Continued—

Tube Rose Creamery, Corning, v. C. B. & Q., of butter in transit.....	1888	736
Rhodes, A., Rhodes, v. C. M. & St. P., in receiving butter.....	1898	74
Sanford, W. H., Amber, v. C. M. & St. P., in handling merchandise.....	1892	798
Schnepf, M., East Elkport, v. C. M. & St. P., in handling freight.....	1899	73
Shepard Bros., Fruitland, v. C. R. I. & P., in transporting melons.....	1889	1031
Spies & Son, Graettinger, v. B. C. R. & N., declining stock market.....	1892	865
Witmer, F. R. & Son, Mingo, v. C. St. P. & K. C., in handling goods.....	1892	849
DELIVERY, WHAT CONSTITUTES.....	1885	555

## DEMURRAGE—

Butler, William, Clarinda, v. Wabash, loading cars from wagons.....	1883	711
Bebbington, George, Council Bluffs, v. ———, time allowed for loading.....	1892	843
Brown, W. S., Manson, v. Ill. Cent., charges.....	1899	120
Campbell & Mehlman, Massena, v. O. B. & Q., delay in forwarding freight.....	1889	1017
Cars loaded from wagons, same rates as when loaded from elevators.....	1884	526
Discussion of.....	1888	676
Hoffman, A. G., Plato, v. B. C. R. & N., reciprocity in demurrage charges.....	1893	233
Kline, Bennett, Manson, v. Illinois Central, time for unloading cars.....	1896	144
Lefferts, C. S., Council Bluffs, inquiry concerning.....	1895	228
Montzheimer, O. H., Primghar, v. Illinois Central, inquiries concerning.....	1893	234
Pickering, J. C., Cedar Rapids, inquiry concerning.....	1899	114
Red Oak, trustees of, v. C. B. & Q., time for loading and unloading cars.....	1882	554
Rothchild, O. & Co., Davenport, v. C. & N.-W., on cars detained.....	1887	783
Southside Ice Co., Centerville, time allowed for unloading cars.....	1898	51
Tasker, K. S., Onslow, v. O. & N.-W., on erroneous weight.....	1895	182
DEPOT GROUNDS, ADDITIONAL LANDS FOR—Power of company to condemn.....	1884	86

DEPOT GROUNDS, CONDEMNING LANDS FOR—see *Condemnation Proceedings*.DEPOTS, ETC., DANGEROUS LOCATION OF—see *Stations*; also *Obstruction to View of Highway Crossing*.DEPOTS, UNION—see *Union Depots*.DETENTION—see *Damages*.

DEY, PETER A., commissioner, paper on reasonable rates.....	1893	40a
Dissenting opinion of, in Iowa rate case.....	1894	229
Paper on pooling.....	1894	363
DIRECT ROUTE, most, shipper entitled to rates based on.....	1892	841

## DISCRIMINATION—

In rates—see <i>Rates</i> .		
In furnishing cars—see <i>Failure to Furnish Cars</i> .		
In granting sites—see <i>Sites</i> .		
In granting monopoly of shipping facilities against public policy—see <i>Monopoly</i> .		
In inspection of butter and egg shipments.....	1893	234
Against towns in rates.....	1885	44
Laws against, obeyed in letter, violated in spirit.....	1878	16
In use of private cars.....	1891	30
Just and unjust—see also <i>Just Discrimination</i> .....	1880, 179;	75
Law prohibiting.....	1888	31
In passenger rates.....	1891	759
Discussion of, by L. S. Coffin.....	1883	86

## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—

Adsit, Silas, Colfax, v. C. R. I. & P., in refusing to stamp excursion tickets.....	1885	571
Ames, M. Y., Marcus, v. Illinois Central, in size of cars furnished.....	1886	516
Anderson, T., Rockford, Ill., v. C. M. & St. P., jewelry sample trunks.....	1885	541
Arnold, J. M., Davis City, v. O. B. & Q., in rates on posts.....	1888	781
Atkins & Sons, Osceola, v. C. B. & Q., in furnishing cars.....	1881	127
Baker Bros., Ottumwa, v. C. R. I. & P., special rates on butter and eggs.....	1880	74
Baker Wire Co., Des Moines, v. Various Railways, in carload rates.....	1887	714
Ball & Minert, Bristow, v. Dubuque & Dakota, in live stock rates.....	1885	511
Barrett, J. E. & Son, Mt. Vernon, v. C. & N.-W., in rates on flour.....	1886	482
Beeman, C. D., Waukon, v. O. M. & St. P., interstate in rates.....	1897	96
Bellamy & Sons, Knoxville, v. Various Railway Lines, in rates.....	1882	493
Bingham Alliance, v. Wabash, against shippers who load from wagons.....	1884	525
Blow, M., Estherville, v. B. C. R. & N., refusal to lease site for coal shed.....	1886	497

## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—Continued—

Board of Trade and Henry Ooker, Council Bluffs, v. C. R. I. & P., coal.....	1888	834
Bogart, George, Shenandoah, v. C. R. I. & P., in honoring round trip tickets.....	1890	939
Brechtbill & Byers, Berlin, v. C. St. P. & K. O., cars for certain markets.....	1890	932
Burlington, shippers of, v. B. C. R. & N., in local Iowa rates.....	1890	869
Bussard, J. & Co., Imogene, v. Wabash, St. L. & P., in coal rates.....	1884	497
Butler, William, Clarinda, v. Wabash, on grain when loaded from wagons.....	1883	711
Byram, M. W., Fremont, v. Iowa Cent., in sale of round trip tickets.....	1891	727
Campbell, F. R., Bismarck, v. C. M. & St. P., in sale of excursion tickets.....	1892	849
Clark & Shute, Geneva, v. Iowa Cent., in coal rates, schedule fixed.....	1880	28
Coal Exchange, Boone, v. C. & N.-W., in coal rates.....	1884	559
Coal Exchange, Boone, v. C. & N.-W., in rates on coal and overcharge.....	1884	589
Corey Coal Co., Lehigh, v. Crooked Creek R'd, in furnishing cars.....	1898	16
Council Bluffs Board of Trade v. K. C. St. J. & C. B. and Pullman Palace Car Co., in sleeping car accommodations.....	1888	702
Council Bluffs, citizens of, v. Union Pacific, against Council Bluffs.....	1886	530
Council Bluffs Board of Trade v. various lines, in inspection service.....	1889	977
Crystal Mill Co., Council Bluffs, v. pool lines, in classifying flour.....	1883	703
Crystal Mill Co., Council Bluffs, in flour rates.....	1883	715
Crystal Mill & Grain Co., Council Bluffs, v. C. R. I. & P. et al., in coal rates.....	1896	185
Davenport, shippers of, v. B. C. R. & N. and C. R. I. & P., against local and in favor of interstate shipments, in withdrawing and refusing joint tariffs on local business while permitting same on interstate business; in delaying local shipments by compelling rebilling at West Liberty, and forwarding interstate shipments in special car attached to passenger train.....	1889 1023-1087	
Diamond Jo line of steamers v. C. B. & Q., in prepayment of charges.....	1889 1074, 1077	
Donahue, Robert, Burlington, v. Cent. Iowa, prepayment of freight.....	1884	550
Dudley, W., Churdan, v. D. M. N. & W., in freight rates.....	1899	83
Dunwoodie, Jos., Cylinder, v. C. M. & St. P., in refusing to stop trains.....	1891	739
Dusey, H., et al., Creston, v. C. B. & Q. R. R. Co., refusal to carry mechanic's tool box as baggage.....	1885	513
Earle, W. C., Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P. and B. C. R. & N., stock rates.....	1886	508
Farley, J. M., Whittemore, v. C. M. & St. P., in furnishing cars.....	1898	44
Fonda Implement Co. v. D. M. N. & W., in short haul rates.....	1896	137
Fowler Company, The, Waterloo, v. Ill. Cent., in rates on apples.....	1886	484
Frazier & Ballou, Primghar, v. D. & S. C. (Ill. Cent.), in furnishing cars.....	1890	940
Fritz & Douglass, Waverly, v. Ill. Cent., et al., in not applying commissioners' schedule of rates.....	1889	1062
Gally, W. H., Zearing, v. Cent. Iowa, cars loaded from wagons.....	1885	573
Gray, M. J., Ledyard, v. C. & N.-W., in shipment of hay.....	1895	168
Green, J. A., et al., Stone City, v. C. M. & St. P., in requiring shippers to protect cars for stone shipments at private expense.....	1893	860
Hackmen of Sioux City v. all railways, in omnibus privileges.....	1890	881
Hale, George H., Washington, v. C. R. I. & P., in grain rates.....	1887	726
Hallack, W. B., Winthrop, v. Ill. Cent., in rates on live stock.....	1889	1050
Hanner, J. R. A., Delmar, v. C. M. & St. P., in passenger fares.....	1896	112
Harmon, A. B., Havelock, v. C. & N.-W., in rates.....	1888	746
Hayes, Michael, Washington, v. C. R. I. & P., in distribution of cars.....	1882	489
Hill, John N., Fort Dodge, v. M. & St. L., in freight rates.....	1882	557
Hise Bros., Washington, v. C. R. I. & P., refrigerator cars.....	1886	568
Hodges, N. W., Storm Lake, v. Ill. Cent., in side-track privileges and site.....	1890	887
Hummer Co., George, Iowa City, v. B. C. R. & N., in classification.....	1880	153
Huntington, William, Calmus, v. C. & N.-W., in coal rates.....	1888	695
Independence Mill Co. v. Ill. Cent. and C. M. & St. P., on wheat and flour.....	1882 413, 444	
Iowa Flour and Oil Co., Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., in flour rates.....	1888	664
Iowa State Jobbers and Mfrs. Assn., v. Iowa trunk lines, in rates.....	1885	535
Irwin, Phillips & Co., Keokuk, v. D. M. & Ft. D., in merchandise rates.....	1880	71
Jameson, G. O., Clarion, v. M. C. & Ft. D., in rates on grain, coal, etc.....	1888	713
Jansen, Anten, Haverhill, v. O. M. & St. P., in furnishing shipping facilities.....	1888	828
Jerome, F. H., Villisca, v. C. B. & Q., in corn rates.....	1882	445
Johnson, J., Huxley, v. C. M. & St. P., in corn rates.....	1887	681
Kanau, Sprengle, Imogene, v. Wabash, in corn rates.....	1883	704



## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—Continued—

	Year	Page
Keeler, A., Imogene, v. C. B. & St. L., in rates on posts.....	1886	582
Keokuk & D. M. Ry. Co. v. D. M. & Ft. D. R. R. Co., in forwarding cars.....	1878	5
Knowles, W. F., James, v. C. St. P., M. & O., in sale of tickets.....	1898	138
Larrabee, Gov. William, v. C. B. & Q., in coal rates.....	1887	624, 670
Leese & Long, Crawfordsville, v. B. & N. W., rates on lumber.....	1881	126
Lighthall, B., Alden, v. Ill. Cent., in rates.....	1882	564
Long, G. I., Manson, v. C. R. I. & P., in grain rates to Chicago.....	1889	1093
Malden, T. E., et al., Manson, v. Ill. Cent. R. R. Co., in lumber rates.....	1883	611
McCallsburg, citizens of, v. Cent. Iowa, in elevator privileges.....	1885	574
McNutt, H. S., Algona, v. C. M. & St. P., in furnishing cars.....	1891	826
Merrill & Co., Ottumwa, v. Cent. Iowa, in rates.....	1881	134
Merrill, J. H. & Co., Ottumwa, v. K. & W., in freight charges.....	1888	739
Merrill & Keeney, Des Moines, v. C. & N. W., in carload rates.....	1883	678
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Anderson.....	1883	683
Mooney & Jones, St. Anthony, v. Cent. Iowa, in coal rates.....	1884	510
Nye, J. P., Essex, v. C. B. & Q. R. R. Co., in corn rates.....	1883	724
Nonparell Printing Co. v. Various Lines, in newspaper privileges.....	1892	857
Parker, S. F., Eastville, v. C. & N. W., in rates—minimum charge.....	1882	457
Pritchard & Skewis, Inwood, v. C. M. & St. P., in lumber rates.....	1888	704
Rand Lumber Co., Burlington, v. C. B. & Q., in rates.....	1882	550
Red Oak, township trustees of, et al., v. C. B. & Q., in rates and rebates.....	1882	554
Red Oak, township trustees of, et al., v. C. B. & Q., against small shippers.....	1882	554
Riley, W. H., Crawfordsville, v. B. & N. W., in rates on lumber.....	1880	147
Roberts, C. L., Grinnell, v. C. R. I. & P., in side track facilities.....	1889	1027
Rosa, Albert, Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., in corn rates to Chicago.....	1882	484
Saucer, W. H., Ackley, v. Ill. Cent., in rates on marble.....	1883	689
Schell, F. J., Breda, v. C. & N. W., in furnishing cars.....	1891	828
Shaver & Dows, Cedar Rapids, v. Joint Western Classification, crackers.....	1883	659
Shepherd & Carpenter, Iowa City, v. C. R. I. & P. and B., C. R. & N., in rates to non-competing points.....	1883	637
Shinnon, Thos., Rolfe, v. C. R. I. & P., in stock rates to Chicago.....	1896	79
Smith & Boynton, Spencer, v. C. M. & St. P., in coal rates.....	1885	524
Smith Bros., Waterloo, v. B. C. R. & N., in hard coal rates.....	1883	676
Smith, J. N., Fairfield, v. C. B. & Q., in size of cars, etc.....	1883	647
Spencer Bros., Randolph, v. C. B. & Q., in rates and overcharge.....	1882	540
State of Iowa, by Governor Larrabee, in coal rates.....	1887	624, 670
Steer, William M., West Branch, v. B. C. R. & N., on coal and mileage ticket.....	1884	557
Stevenson, C. E., Rockwell City, v. D. M. N. & W., in passenger fares.....	1895	183
Sullivan, J. W., et al., Algona, v. C. & N. W., in sale of excursion tickets.....	1892	847
Taylor, J. C., Des Moines, v. C. B. & Q., in freight rates.....	1882	531
Toledo, Peoria & Warsaw Ry., v. B. C. R. & N., in bridge privileges.....	1878	28
Tomlinson, R. B. & Co., Cedar Rapids, v. Ill. Cent., 1,000-mile tickets.....	1882	436
Vincent, T. F., Union Stock Yards, Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., in switching charges, etc.....	1896	105
Way & Packard, Cedar Falls, v. B. C. R. & N., in allowing damages.....	1883	559
Wells, W. W., Webster City, v. W. O. & S. W., in coal rates and site.....	1889	1045
Westphal, Hinds & Co., Dubuque, v. B. C. R. & N., in classification.....	1881	125
White & Kline, Meriden, v. Ill. Cent., in furnishing cars.....	1896	148
Williams, E. D., Given, v. Cent. Iowa, in distribution of cars.....	1881	126
Williams, George T., Ida Grove, v. C. & N. W., in rates.....	1884	581
Wilson, John L., West Liberty, v. C. R. I. & P., rebates.....	1885	504
Winkler, J. W., Woodward, v. C. M. & St. P., grain and live stock.....	1893	705
York, Joseph, Zenorsville, v. C. & N. W., in coal rates.....	1888	669
DISTRIBUTION OF CARS.		
Equitable rule for in time of scarcity.....	1888, 719; 1889, 996; 1892	827
Consolidation Coal Co. v. Cent. Iowa.....	1878	23
Howard & Son, Oskaloosa, v. Cent. Iowa, discrimination in.....	1881	130
Johnson, T. N., Reasoner, v. C. R. I. & P., discrimination in.....	1881	131
Melott, E. H., Ogden, v. C. & N. W., discrimination in.....	1881	141
Stocker, J. W., Logan, v. C. & N. W., discrimination in.....	1881	127

DIVERSION OF BUSINESS—see, also, *Freight*.

	Year	Page
Crow, W. D., Traer, v. B. C. R. & N., of freight.....	1885	581
Norman, citizens of, v. M. & St. L., building side track.....	1887	685
Read, W. H., Vinton, v. B. C. R. & N., of grain.....	1886	491
DIVISION OF RATES TO SHORT LINES—see <i>Percentages and Short Lines</i> .		
DIVISION AND PERCENTAGES IN POOLS—see <i>Pooling</i> .		
DODGE, GEN. G. M., "Railroad Situation in the West.".....	1888	39
DRAINAGE—see, also, <i>Obstruction and Overflow</i> .		
Duty of railway company in relation thereto.....	1884	86
In relation to railroad crossings.....	1887	735
DUBUQUE & DAKOTA RAILROAD, history of.....	1879	108
DUBUQUE, SHIPPERS OF, COMPLAINTS ON RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
DYNAMITE, EXPLOSION OF, AT COUNCIL BLUFFS—see <i>Explosion</i> .		

## EARNINGS.

Average per mile under Granger tariff.....	1878	62
Of branch lines.....	1889	1005
Of fictitious capital and miles of road built therefrom, table of.....	1891	36, 87
Discussed in letter of W. G. Purdy, vice-president C. R. I. & P. Ry. Co.....	1889	8
In excess of 6 per cent on \$30,000 per mile, 1874 to 1888.....	1891	36, 87
Increase over previous year.....	1880	160
Increase of under commissioner's rates—see <i>Rates</i> .		
In Iowa, difficulty of obtaining satisfactory information concerning.....	1889	7
In Iowa, 1887-1891, compared.....	1891	16
per mile greater than in Nebraska.....	1894	198
comparative table in Iowa, 1887 to 1894, inclusive.....	1894	214
comparative table 1878-1899 inclusive.....	1899	6
decrease of state and interstate in 1894, compared with 1893.....	1894	215
decrease not chargeable to effect of Iowa schedule.....	1894	216
decrease of on account of crop failure and business depression.....	1895	1v
Losses in, from low rates at competitive points must be made up at non-competing stations.....	1882	43
Under commissioners' rates.....	1891	13
EFFECT OF COMMISSIONERS' RATES ON IOWA ROADS—see <i>Rates, Freight</i> .		
EJECTION FROM TRAIN.		
Clark, Rev. S. F., Nassau, v. B. C. R. & N., wrongful.....	1887	676
Marron, J. P., Jackson Jct., v. C. M. & St. P., wrongful.....	1899	57
Ovren, Olof, Sioux Rapids, v. C. & N. W., failure to purchase ticket.....	1891	780
Potter, John, Lynnville, v. C. R. I. & P., wrongful.....	1890	898
ELECTRICITY.		
Possibility of electricity superseding steam as motive power.....	1891	25
Signal, electric, at dangerous crossing.....	1892, 806; 1893	138
ELEVATION OF RAILROADS—see <i>Topographical Discussion</i> .		
ELEVATOR.		
Right of company to order removal of when obstructing view of crossing.....	1886	566
Capacity of, inquiry concerning.....	1899	87
ELEVATOR SITES—see <i>Sites</i> .		
ELEVATOR, FORCED REMOVAL OF—see <i>Site</i> .		
EMINENT DOMAIN, POWER OF, IN CONDEMNING DEPOT GROUNDS—see <i>Condemnation Proceedings</i> .		
EMPLOYES.		
Comparative table 1878-1899 inclusive.....	1899	12
Decrease in number of, account of crop failure.....	1895	1v
Hours of service of, should be limited by statute.....	1891	18
Number of.....	1879	50, 131
Number and compensation of, decrease in 1894 compared with 1893.....	1894	215, 216
not chargeable to effect of Iowa schedule.....	1894	216
Reduction of number in, discussed.....	1891	17
EMPLOYEES AND SALARIES IN IOWA, comparative table of, 1882-1893.....	1893, 9; 1894	216
In Iowa.....	1892	13, 14
ENGINES, INCREASED CAPACITY OF.....	1898	4, 5
Creston, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., employed on account of strike.....	1887	787



	Year	Page
ENGINEERS' STRIKE—see <i>Strikes</i> .		
ENGLISH commissioner system.....	1878	57
EQUALIZED RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
EQUIPMENT.		
Carriers must anticipate and provide sufficient for ordinary business, but not for unexpected or extraordinary demands.....	1892	761
What constitutes adequate.....	1891	833
COST OF—see <i>Cost</i> .		
REFUSAL OF COMPANY TO SEND OFF ITS OWN LINE—see <i>Refusal to Receive and Forward Freight</i> ; also, <i>Failure to Furnish Cars</i> .		
ERRORS BY AGENTS IN QUOTING RATES; LIABILITY OF CARRIERS FOR—see <i>Liability</i> .		
ESTABLISHMENT OF STATIONS—see <i>Stations</i> .		
EXCESS BAGGAGE CHARGES—see <i>Baggage Charges</i> .		
EXCESSIVE CAPITALIZATION—see <i>Capitalization and Watered Stock</i> .		
EXCESSIVE EXPRESS CHARGES—see <i>Express Charges</i> .		
EXCESSIVE RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
EXCESSIVE HOURS FOR TRAIN MEN.		
Ogilvie, O. G., Muscatine, v. C., R. I. & P.....	1897	79
EXCLUSIVE USE OF STATION GROUNDS, must not be granted to one person.....	1890	893-895
EXCURSION RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
EXCURSION TICKETS.		
Adair, Silas, Olfax, v. C., R. I. & P., refusal to stamp excursion tickets.....	1885	571
Von Rolf, Th., West Union, v. B., C. R. & N., failure to honor.....	1895	200
Rights of holders of, after limitation has expired.....	1885	565
EXPENSES.		
Reduction of, recommended.....	1889	10
Compared, 1878-1899 inclusive.....	1899	6
Decrease in 1894 compared with 1893.....	1894	215
not chargeable to effect of Iowa schedule.....	1894	216
EXPENSES OF COMMISSION.		
Special fund should be set apart for this purpose.....	1879	6
EXPLOSION—of dynamite in Council Bluffs.....	1881	69
EXPLOSIVES, DANGEROUS.		
Bosquet, H. T., Pella, v. C., R. I. & P., refusal of company to carry.....	1894	264
EXPRESS COMPANIES—		
Law concerning express rates.....	1896, 5; 1897, 5; 1898	8
Live stock contracts of.....	1897	5
EXPRESS CHARGES—		
Freeman, F. M., Davis City, v. American Express Co., overcharge, dogs.....	1892	854
Furry, A. R., Alden, v. Adams Express Co., rates based on shortest route.....	1892	841
Joseph, J. M., Creston, v. American Express Co., excessive on pig.....	1890	931
Joseph, J. M., Creston, v. American Express Co., request for reopening case.....	1891	802
Knowles, W. F., James, v. American Express Co., excessive.....	1891	771
Lambing, W. W., West Liberty, v. U. S. Express Co., regulations concerning shipment of live hogs.....	1898	95
McCracken, Rev. C. S., Rock Valley, v. Adams Express Co., damage to books.....	1892	853
EXTRA BAGGAGE CHARGES—see <i>Baggage</i> .		
Extra charge for special train to carry freight.....	1887	782
EXTRA FARE FOR FAILURE TO PURCHASE TICKET—see <i>Passenger Fare</i> .		
FACILITIES FOR DOING BUSINESS AT STATIONS—see, also, <i>Stations</i> .....	1895	xxix
FACILITIES INCREASED—on railroads for handling business.....	1891	25
FAILURE TO FURNISH CARS—		
Achorn, O. E., Sutherland, v. C. & N.-W., for certain market.....	1892	858
Achorn, O. E., Sutherland, v. C. & N.-W., failure to forward foreign cars.....	1896	73
Advance Alliance No. 415, Kirkman, v. C. & N.-W., for shipment of coal.....	1890	943
Akron Milling Co. v. C., M. & St. P., for grain.....	1899	122
Ashburn, J. M., Lamoni, v. C., B. & Q., damage for delay in furnishing.....	1889	989
Bacon, W., Greenfield, v. C., B. & Q., for hay shipments.....	1887	807
Baker, J. C., Emmetsburg, v. C., M. & St. P. railway, for coal.....	1881	142
Band, N. J., Council Bluffs, v. Wabash, for corn.....	1882	451

	Year	Page
FAILURE TO FURNISH CARS—Continued—		
Bennett, J. E. O., Britt, v. M. & St. L., for general shipments.....	1887	806
Benson, George, et al., Muscatine, v. C., R. I. & P., for vegetables.....	1887	758
Bergman, H., McGregor, v. C., M. & St. P., for shipments of ice.....	1892	833
Breazeale, J. A., Centerville, v. Wabash, for shipments of coal.....	1883	568
Brodsky, L., Plover, v. C., R. I. & P., for hay shipments.....	1887	803
Brown, G. H. & Co., Armstrong, v. B., C. R. & N., for hay.....	1895	179
Brown, M. & Son, Whittemore, v. C., M. & St. P., for shipment of hay.....	1887	791
Bruning & Son, Breda, v. C. & N.-W., for shipment of potatoes.....	1892	848
Bruning Bros., Breda, v. C. & N.-W., for grain shipments.....	1892, 840; 1898, 58, 92; 1899	66
Butler, Geo. I. & Co., Knoxville, v. C., B. & Q., for coal.....	1880	141
Butler, W. E. et al., Galva, v. C. & N.-W., for shipments of grain.....	1887	798
Butts, F. M., Wesley, v. B., C. R. & N., for coal.....	1887	806
Canavan, John, Paton, v. C., R. I. & P., for shipping corn.....	1889	996
Carpenter, D. J., Beloit, v. C., M. & St. P., for grain shipments.....	1891, 812; 1892, 866; 1893	251
	1895	212
Cathcart Bros. et al., Kingsley, v. C. & N.-W., for grain shipment.....	1887	795
Cathcart Bros., Kingsley, v. C. & N.-W., at non-competitive points.....	1888	720
Chapman, H. G., Sioux City, v. C., M. & St. P., for baled hay.....	1892	759
Clubb, William, What Cheer, v. B., C. R. & N., for coal.....	1880	126
For general discussion of—see, also, <i>Coal Problem</i> .....	1880	571
Corcoran, P., Postville, v. C., M. & St. P., damages on account of.....	1888	727
Corey, George W. et al., v. Crooked Creek Railroad Co., for coal.....	1891	833
Corey Coal Co., Lehigh, v. M. C. & Ft. D., for shipment of coal.....	1892	839
Corey Coal Co., Lehigh, v. M. C. & Ft. D. and Ill. Cent., for coal shipments.....	1893	262
Corey Coal Co., Lehigh, v. Ill. Cent., for coal.....	1896	74
Corkhill, T. E., Jr., Minburn, v. C., R. I. & P., damages from delay.....	1888	721
Crylle, Robert, Glidden, v. C. & N.-W., for loading stock.....	1888	688
Darby Block Coal Co., Darbyville, v. C., M. & St. P., for coal.....	1898	93
Davenport Syrup Refining Co., Adair, v. C., R. I. & P., for grain.....	1895	219
Des Moines Linseed Oil Works v. B., C. R. & N., for flax seed.....	1894	257
Dickey, W. H., Centerville, v. C., R. I. & P., for coal.....	1880	5
Donahoe, E. A., Havelock, v. C. & N.-W., for hay shipments.....	1887	793
Dorr Cattle Co., Des Moines, v. D. M., N. & W., for slop feed.....	1898	84
Ekmonds, E. J., Marcus, v. Ill. Cent., for grain shipments.....	1896, 141; 1897	145
Elgin Canning Co., Elgin, v. B., C. R. & N. et al., for shipments to St. Paul.....	1892	729
Farmers' Alliance, Coon Rapids, v. C., M. & St. P., for shipments of coal.....	1892	845
Fockler, P. H., Independence, v. Ill. Cent., for hay shipments.....	1887	805
Frazer & Ballou, Pringhar, v. D. & S. C. (Ill. Cent.), for shipment of grain.....	1890	940
Garlock, W. E. et al., Gilmore, v. C., R. I. & P., for hay shipments.....	1887	804
General complaint concerning.....	1889, 791, 810	
Globe Coal Co., Des Moines, v. Iowa Cent., for coal shipments.....	1896	154
Gray, M. J., Ledyard, v. C. & N.-W., hay.....	1895	168
Green, J. A., et al., Stone City, v. C., M. & St. P., for stone shipments; unless protected by shipper at private expense.....	1892	860
Green, J. C. S., Aurelia, v. Ill. Cent., for grain shipments.....	1890	951
Haddock, Wm. J., Iowa City, v. B., C. R. & N., for coal.....	1883	581
Hambleton Milling Co., Keokuk, v. C., R. I. & P., for grain.....	1895	234
Hanna, H. W., Audubon, v. C., R. I. & P., for coal shipments.....	1887	802
Harrison, George, Emmetsburg, v. C., M. & St. P., for coal.....	1881	143
Hastings, mayor and council of, v. C., B. & Q.....	1880	39
Hayes, Michael, Washington, v. C., R. I. & P.....	1882	489
Hayton & Pearson, Pierson, v. C. & N.-W., grain.....	1898	92
Hershey Lumber Co. et al., Muscatine, v. C., R. I. & P.....	1892	762
Hickey Bros., Aspinwall, v. C., M. & St. P., for grain shipments.....	1892	850
Holcomb, T. B. et al., Muscatine, v. B., C. R. & N. et al., for melons.....	1892	761
Hughey & Son, Wirt, v. H. & S. R. R., refrigerator cars.....	1884	564
Iowa Fuel Co., Des Moines, v. C., St. P. & K. C., for coal shipments.....	1888	718
Johnson Bros., Rippey, v. C., R. I. & P., for corn.....	1890	113
Jordan, W. E., Bancroft, v. C. & N.-W., for grain shipments.....	1887	800
Keystone Coal Co., Rippey, v. D. M. & Ft. D., for coal.....	1881	135
Klemme, H. J. and J., Alexander, v. Ia. Cent., for coal.....	1898	90



## FAILURE TO SUPPLY CARS—Continued—

	Year	Page
Lewis, Wm., Macdonald v. C. B. & Q. for damages.....	1885	824
Marion Coal Co. v. C. R. I. & P. for shipment of coal.....	1892	567
Marshall & Son, Charlton, v. C. B. & Q. failure to run refrigerator cars.....	1884	597
Mason, David, Harlan, v. C. M. & St. P. for shipment of hay.....	1892	651
McNutt, H. S., Algona, v. C. M. & St. P., discrimination in.....	1891	626
Moberly, L. N., Humphrey, Mo., v. Ill. Cent. for cattle.....	1896	67
Muscatine Melon Shippers v. C. R. I. & P. for melons.....	1895	213
Olson, B. & Co., Swea City, v. B. O. R. & N. grain.....	1898	92
O'Neal, Felix et al., Aurelia, v. Ill. Cent. for grain, etc.....	1887	805
Patterson, A. L., Owego, v. C. M. & St. P. for wheat.....	1896	114
Pierson, shippers of, v. C. & N.-W., for grain shipments.....	1887	785
Priest & Stocker, Carroll, v. C. & N.-W., for shipment of live stock.....	1886, 490, 530-527	
Ranks & Sterzbach, Redmon, v. B. O. R. & N., for hay shipments.....	1893	224
Ranks & Sterzbach, Redmon, v. C. & N.-W., cars off its own line.....	1892	848
Reams, Warren, Defiance, v. C. M. & St. P. for grain.....	1898	91
Reilly, Thomas, Blanco, v. C. & N.-W., for hay to Sioux City.....	1895	228
Riley, J. W., Defiance, v. C. M. & St. P. for potatoes.....	1890	124
Riley, A. et al., Rockwell City, v. D. M. & N.-W., for hay shipments.....	1887	894
Rothschild & Co., Davenport, v. C. & N.-W., for patrons.....	1887	738
Rothschild, D., Muscatine, v. Ill. C., for shipments of barley.....	1891	126
Russell & Co., Silver City, v. Wabash, for shipment of corn.....	1883	583
Sand Mount Melon Co., Fruitland, v. C. R. I. & P., for melons.....	1890	897
Schmidt, G. F., Menard, v. C. B. & Q. for grain.....	1890	77
Schell, F. J., Breda, v. C. & N.-W., discrimination in.....	1891	528
Seuffert, L., Burlington, v. C. St. P. & K. C. failure and delay in.....	1891	708
Seymour, T. S., Milford, v. C. M. & St. P. for hay shipments.....	1887	793
Southall, Wm. & Sons, Pierson, v. C. & N.-W., grain.....	1898, 92	1899
Spencer, city and citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., appeal for coal cars.....	1881	139
Stoughton, T. S., Pierson, v. C. & N.-W., must be distributed equitably.....	1892	826
Townsend, Le Mars, v. Ill. Cent. for lumber.....	1883	915
Tuttle Bros., Whittemore, v. C. M. & St. P. for shipment of hay.....	1887	791
Way & Packard, Cedar Falls, v. B. O. R. & N., damage by reason of.....	1895	209
Wayne, E. M., Woolstock, v. C. & N.-W., for grain.....	1895	209
Wedgewood & Co., Storm Lake, v. Ill. Cent. for grain for Minneapolis.....	1898	85
Wells, A. A., Emmetsburg, v. C. M. & St. P., coal.....	1881	144
Weston, Wm., Anita, v. C. R. I. & P., loading cars from wagon.....	1899	118
White, Clayton, Beloit, Kan., v. C. R. I. & P. et al., for stock.....	1887	708
White, Geo. C., Nevada, v. C. & N.-W., for grain.....	1890	121
Williams, Richard, Ida Grove, v. C. & N.-W., for live stock.....	1888	693
Young, O. W., Glidden, v. C. & N.-W., for live stock.....	1888	691
Resolution of Twenty-second General Assembly, directing action for relief.....	1887	798

FAILURE TO FURNISH CARS FOR CERTAIN MARKETS—see *Rights of Shippers*.FAILURE TO STOP AT RAILROAD CROSSING—see *Crossing Stops*.FAILURE TO PURCHASE TICKET—EXTRA FARE MAY BE COLLECTED—see *Passenger Fare*.FAILURE TO STOP PASSENGER TRAINS—see *Passenger Trains*.FAILURE OF COMPANIES TO REPORT—see *Report*.FAILURE TO OPERATE ROAD—see *Abandonment of Road*.FAILURE TO STOP AT CROSSINGS—see *Crossing, Stop*.FAIR CROSSINGS—see *Crossings, Farm*.FAST TRAINS IN CRISIS—see *Speed of Trains*.FAST TRAINS, PETITION TO STOP AT SMALL STATIONS—see *Train Service*."FEEDERS"—see *Local Lines*.

## FENCING.

Law suggested.....	1896	18
Liability of carriers in case of failure to fence.....	1884	499
Provisions of law in relation to.....	1888	19
Railroads' need of fencing.....	1883	91
Recommendations concerning.....	1884	27
Should right of way fences be hog tight.....	1898	78

## FENCING—Continued—

## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING.

Adams, J. Q., Spencer, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to fence.....	1883	561
Bates, L. P., Russell, v. Wabash, St. L. & P. et al., failure to fence.....	1886	603
Buson, R. B., Pattersonville, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to fence.....	1885	567
Buckley, Philip, Pattersonville, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to fence.....	1888	599
Burns, Thomas, Breda, v. C. & N.-W., failure to fence.....	1885	526
Carpenter, O. W., Dedham, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to repair.....	1891	745
Clever, M. G. and Irwin, J. M., Milo, v. C. B. & Q., failure to fence.....	1884	561
Curtis, T. J., Fonda, v. Ill. Cent., fencing track.....	1884	531
Gardner, John M., Leon, v. D. M. O. & S., fencing and cattle guards.....	1884	549
Gatton, Russell, Moscow, v. C. R. I. & P., bad condition of.....	1894	324
Gray, James, Ira, v. O. G. W., stock yards.....	1898	83
Harshberger, W. A., Oakland Mills, v. St. L. & N. W., failure to build.....	1892	841
Howe, E. A., Bridgewater, v. C. B. & Q., relocation of fence.....	1892	842
Hughes, B. M. and Huan, H., Boone, v. M. & St. L., failure to build.....	1884	537
Ingersoll, M. J., Edgewood, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to fence.....	1884	548
Lang, Adams, Froelich, v. C. M. & St. P., hog-tight fence.....	1896	138
Lockwood, J. C., Greene, v. B. O. R. & N., failure.....	1897	107
McDowell, Palmer, et al., Angus, v. M. & St. L. R'y Co., failure to build.....	1885	534
McGehe, H., Martinsburg, v. B. & W., failure.....	1897	133
Mehs, George, Comanche et al., Clinton, v. B. O. R. & N., petition for.....	1893	223
Miller, H. Y., Patersonville, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to fence.....	1885	560
Nicol, Bert, David, v. W. & W., fencing station grounds.....	1895	208
Olsen, John R., Thor, v. C. & N.-W., failure to fence.....	1884	516
Ornelund, J. L., Thor, v. C. & N.-W., failure to fence.....	1884	548
Porter, W. S., Orient, v. C. B. & Q., right of way.....	1898	69
Price, E. T., Winsfield, v. B. & W., failure to fence.....	1885	530
Rebher, Max H., Gladbrook, v. W. I. & N., failure to fence.....	1886	501
Ringland, G. S., Ft. Dodge, v. Crooked Creek, failure to fence.....	1895	190
Shields, Hammer, C., Beulah, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to repair.....	1891	701
Simmons, A. R., East Peru, inquiry concerning hog-tight.....	1898	78
Smull, John, Wick, v. D. M. O. & S., failure to fence.....	1886	556
Tibbets, D. D. et al., Ogden, v. C. Ft. M. & D. M., petition for.....	1892	827
Wakeman, M. A., Otho, v. M. & St. L., to connect with cattle guards.....	1887	716
Waldorf, C., Hudson, S. D., v. C. M. & St. P., failure to fence.....	1887	708
White, S. J., Plymouth, v. C. M. & St. P., maintenance of.....	1881	550
Willkenson, O. W., Thor, v. C. & N.-W., failure to build.....	1884	514

FIRE SET OUT BY ENGINEES—see also *Damages*.

Liability of carriers, exemption by contract, supreme court's opinion..... 1895 XXXV

## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING.

Barnes, P. M., Bart, v. C. & N.-W., fire from engine.....	1885	519
Bradley, C. J., Goria, v. C. R. I. & P., property destroyed by fire.....	1895	1085
Bridge, A. M., Goldfield, v. B. C. M. & St. P., to hay.....	1887	928
Brunskill, D. H., Hadden, v. C. M. & St. P., damage to crops.....	1889	1068
Bulls, L. A., Russell, v. C. B. & Q., fire set out by engine.....	1886	507
Butting, C., Brush Creek, v. C. M. & St. P., fire from engine.....	1886	611
Enfield, James, Herndon, v. C. M. & St. P., to house from fire by engine.....	1884	584
Erickson, E. B., Hurley, v. C. M. & St. P., fire set by engine.....	1887	708
Guthrie, I. N., Newton, v. C. R. I. & P., fire set by engine.....	1889	1030
Hasking, A. N., Estherville, v. B. O. R. & N., fire from locomotive.....	1883	541
McNamara, Martin, Grafton, v. C. M. & St. P., fire from locomotive.....	1884	322
Nevels, C. H., Parkersburg, v. I. C. R'd Co., to meadow.....	1898	79
Riechers, J. C., Point Lookout, Utah, v. C. & N.-W., damage.....	1899	73
Roy, Peter, Tara, v. D. M. & Ft. D. R. Co., fire set by engine.....	1885	503
Searles, D. D., Sloan, v. C. B. & P., fire set by engine.....	1887	725
Stevens, C. B., Donnellson, v. C. B. & K. C., fence destroyed.....	1888	697
Tartsch, William, Paton, v. C. R. I. & P., damage to hay.....	1899	935
Travis, S. N., Peru, v. St. P. & K. C., damages resulting from.....	1892	799
Wertz, J. J., Russell, v. C. B. & Q., fire on meadow set by engine.....	1886	607
FLOODS, losses by in Iowa.....	1891	17



	Year	Page
FORDWARDING CARS—see <i>Refusal to Receive and Forward Freight</i> .		
FREE TRANSPORTATION—see <i>Transportation</i> ; also <i>Rates</i> .		
FREIGHT CARS—see <i>Cars</i> .		
FREIGHT CHARGES, per ton, per mile.....	1880	172
FREIGHT CHARGES GUARANTEED—see <i>Charges Prepaid or Guaranteed</i> .		
FREIGHT CHARGES, prepayment demanded, insolvency of connecting line.....	1878	15
—see also <i>Charges</i> .		
FREIGHT, CLASSIFICATION OF—see <i>Classification</i> .....	1885	54
FREIGHT, DIVERSION OF—see <i>Diversion of Freight</i> .		
FREIGHT, PREPAYMENTS—see, also, <i>Charges</i> .		
Donahue, Robert, Burlington, v. Cent. Iowa, prepayment of.....	1884	550
FREIGHT—REFUSAL TO DELIVER.		
Dow & Mercer, McVeigh, v. Ft. Mad. & N. W., wrongful withholding.....	1884	500
Melrose, N. M., Goldfield, v. C. & N.-W., failure to deliver at station.....	1884	560
FREIGHT TRAINS, STOPPING OF AT PLATFORMS—see <i>Stopping Trains at Platforms</i> .		
FREIGHT TRAINS CARRYING PASSENGERS—see <i>Train Service</i> .		
FUEL, APPROPRIATION OF BY CARRIERS—see <i>Appropriation of Coal</i> .		
ONG, electric, for crossing—see <i>Electric Signals</i> .....	1893	138
GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.....	1891	28
GOVERNOR'S QUESTIONS FOR REPORTS—see <i>Reports</i> .		
GRADES, REDUCTION OF.....	1898	4
GRADE CROSSINGS, FARM—see <i>Crossings, Farm</i> .		
GRADE CROSSINGS, HIGHWAYS OR STREETS—see <i>Crossings, Highway</i> .		
GRADE CROSSING, RAILROAD—see <i>Crossings, Railroad</i> .		
GRAIN FOR SEED, reduced rates for.....	1892	838
GRAIN HOUSE, SITES FOR—see <i>Sites</i> .		
GRANGER LAW, and tariff, workings of discussed.....	1878, Appendix cxi;	1878
GRANGER LAW, discussion of.....	1885	84
GRANGER MOVEMENT IN THE WEST, history of, by Spencer Smith.....	1889	21
GRANGER TARIFF, EARNINGS UNDER—see <i>Earnings</i> .		
GREAT BRITAIN, RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS OF—see <i>Commissioners</i> .		
HACKS AND OMNIBUSES, PRIVILEGES OF AT STATION—see <i>Omnibus Privileges and Discrimination</i> .		
HAY RATES, petition of D. M. N. & W. for advance in.....	1893	166
HEATING OF CARS—see <i>Warming Cars</i> .		
HEIGHT of platforms at stations.....	1889	1071
HEPBURN, committee report.....	1880 174;	181
HIGHWAY, The, and the railway.....	1881	79
HIGHWAYS, establishment of, commissioners no authority over.....	1892	828
HIGHWAY, relocation, expense of crossing must be borne by railroad company....	1889	1035
HIGHWAY CROSSINGS, DANGEROUS—see <i>Crossings, Highway</i> .		
Keep, F. A., Beloit, v. C., M. & St. P., by relocation of track.....	1885	561
HISTORY of Iowa railroads.....	1879, 83; 1880, 239; 1896	179
HISTORY OF THE RAILROAD QUESTION IN IOWA—see <i>Railroad Question</i> .		
HOTEL PATRONAGE, SOLICITATION OF—see <i>Omnibus Privileges</i> .		
IMPROVEMENTS of roads and rolling stock.....	1891, 4; 1899	3
INCOMPETENT ENGINEERS—see <i>Engineers</i> .		
INCREASE OF EARNINGS UNDER COMMISSIONERS' RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
INJUNCTION, B., C. R. & N., IN JOINT RATES—see <i>Joint Rates</i> .		
INJUNCTION—see <i>Rates and Joint Rates</i> .		
INJUNCTION, by Judges Brewer and Fairall, v. Schedule of 1883.....	1888	36
INJURIES TO PERSONS—see <i>Personal Injuries</i> .		
INSOLVENCY OF CONNECTING LINE, prepayment demanded.....	1878	15
INSPECTION OF RAILROADS IN IOWA.....	1898	7
INSPECTION SERVICE.		
Baker Bros. and Samuel Lilburn Co., Ottumwa, butter and egg shipments.....	1893	234
Council Bluffs Board of Trade v. C., R. I. & P. and C. & N.-W.....	1889	977

	Year	Page
INSUFFICIENT PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE—see <i>Train Service</i> .		
INTERLOCKING SWITCHES, advisability of their adoption discussed.....	1889	18
Adoption of in Iowa.....	1897	6
Discussion of.....	1898	5
List of in Iowa.....	1899	10
Belknap, v. C., R. I. & P. and Wabash.....	1897	35
Carnforth, crossing of C. & N.-W. and C., R. I. & P.....	1896	48
Centerville, crossing of K. & W. and C., R. I. & P.....	1898	30
Davenport, C., R. I. & P. and B., C. R. & N.....	1897, 46; 1898	31
Fairfield, C., R. I. & P. and C., B. & Q.....	1897	47
Ft. Madison, drawbridge of A., T. & S. Fe R'y.....	1899	37
Libertyville, C., R. I. & P. and C., Ft. M. & D. M.....	1897	35
Malvern, crossing of C., B. & Q. and C. & St. Louis.....	1898	32
Melbourne, crossing of C. G. W. and Ia. Cent.....	1898	32
Neola, C., R. I. & P. and C., M. & St. P.....	1897	47
Ottumwa, C., R. I. & P. and C., B. & Q.....	1897, 45; 1899	33
Seymour, crossing of C. M. & St. P. and C., R. I. & P.....	1896	47
INTERSECTIONS, FAILURE TO STOP AT—see <i>Crossing Stops</i> .		
INTERSTATE COMMERCE LAW, VIOLATION OF—see <i>Rates</i> .		
INTERSTATE COMMERCE—see, also, <i>State Commerce</i> .		
Application for suspension of long and short haul clause.....	1887	714
Committee on, from United States senate.....	1885	32
Desirability of establishment of interstate commerce commission.....	1882	49
Discussion of.....	1882	42
Discussion of, Interstate Commerce Railway association.....	1890	24
Interstate commerce law, violation of.....	1888	608
Interstate and state commerce, discussion of.....	1886	36
Interstate and state commerce.....	1880, 188; 1894, 164; 1895	216
Interstate commerce law anticipated.....	1882	35
Its nature discussed in supreme court's decision.....	1892	38, 39
Law of 1873.....	1878	55
Law regulating, discussed by the board.....	1887	31
Powers of the state in reference to.....	1887, 50; 1894	164
Reagan bill.....	1882	42
Rates on, necessity for elasticity in.....	1882	45
Resolution of the Twentieth General Assembly, asking congressional action.....	1884	86
What constitutes Diamond Jo line case.....	1880, 1074; 1077	
D. J. Carpenter case.....	1890	849
H. R. Heath & Son's case.....	1894	164
IOWA COAL RATES, PETITION FOR ADVANCE IN—see <i>Rates</i> .		
IOWA COMMISSIONER LAW DISCUSSED—see <i>Commissioners</i> .		
IOWA FALLS & SIOUX CITY RAILROAD, history of.....	1879	109
IOWA MIDLAND RAILWAY, history of.....	1879	110
IOWA RAILROADS, HISTORY OF—see <i>History of Iowa Railroads</i> .		
JOBGING—Number of persons employed in 1884.....	1884	76
JOBGING AND MANUFACTURING.		
Amount of sales in 1884.....	1884	76
Products in 1884.....	1884	77
Net increase of business of 1883.....	1884	76
Materials in 1884.....	1884	77
Jobbing in Iowa, number of people interested in.....	1885	49
JOBBER'S RATES DISCUSSED—see <i>Carload Rates and Rates</i> .....	1884	73
Tons of freight moved in 1884.....	1884	76
Petition for restoration of jobbers and manufacturers' rates.....	1885	535
Wages paid by, in 1884.....	1884	77
Capital employed in, in Iowa.....	1884	76
Jobbers in Iowa should be placed on equality with those of outside points.....	1885	52
JOINT RATES—see, also, <i>Rates, Joint</i> .		
Carpenter, E. E., case discussed.....	1890	8
Commissioners enjoined from establishing by B., C. R. & N.....	1890	6
Commissioners' joint rate discussed.....	1891	14



	Year	Page
<b>JOINT RATES—Continued—</b>		
Deemer, J., decision concerning .....	1895	xxiii
Desirability of between all Iowa lines .....	1887	717
Joint rates, status of discussed .....	1895	5
Dissenting opinion of Justices Rothrock and Robinson concerning .....	1891	49
Eighty per cent schedule higher than rates voluntarily charged by carriers or those now in effect on interstate traffic .....	1891	15
Failure to apply on flaxseed shipments .....	1891	762
In force in other states, but refused in Iowa .....	1894	197
Injunction proceedings against commission .....	1891	45
Law and discussion in reference in joint rates .....	1890	4
Laws relating to .....	1895	xvii
Legislation recommended .....	1891, 50;	xxix
List of roads refusing to accept commissioners' .....	1891	14
List of roads accepting same .....	1891	15
Litigation on .....	1890	6
Must be applied for and refused to shippers before petitioning board .....	1895	xxviii
Opinion of Iowa supreme court concerning .....	1891, 45-50;	xxv
Opinion of supreme court in reference to B. C. R. & N. Injunction case .....	1893	27
Opinion of supreme court in reference to Blair v. S. C. & N. .....	1897	295
Overcharges on account of roads failing to apply, ordered refunded .....	1891	763
Power of states to fix through rates over two or more lines .....	1891	47
Petition by carrier to extend time of trial of, account of apparent increase of earnings under .....	1891	15
Reasons for motion to dissolve injunction and reasons for injunction .....	1891	46
Rules for fixing rates for continuous haul (80 per cent schedule) .....	1890	6
Schedule and order concerning .....	1895	xxii
Status and discussion of .....	1895	xviii
Violation of joint rate law by one carrier no excuse for another .....	1891	763
Willingness of Ill. Cent. to apply in Iowa .....	1891	763
<b>COMPLAINTS CONCERNING.</b>		
Baker, W., manager Columbia Coal Co., Diamond, v. Iowa Central .....	1894	337
Campbell, F. M., & Co., Randolph, v. C. B. & Q., failure to apply .....	1895	194
Cedar Falls Paper Mfg. Co., v. C. B. & Q. and B. C. R. & N., petition for .....	1889	1085
Cedar Falls Paper Mfg. Co., v. Iowa Central and C. G. W., refusal to apply .....	1893	250
Columbia Coal Co., Diamond, v. Iowa Central, refusal to apply .....	1894	337
Coon Valley Coal Co., Des Moines, v. C. St. P. & K. C., discrimination in .....	1892	767
Corey Coal Co., Lehigh, v. M. C. & Ft. D., petition for .....	1892	839
Darby, J. H., Belmont, v. M. C. & Ft. D., refusal to apply, overcharge .....	1895	303
Davenport, shippers of, v. B. C. R. & N., et al., petition for .....	1889, 1022;	1087
Flint, F. C., Manchester, v. C. M. & St. P., refusal of through billing .....	1896	81
Ft. Madison Chair Co., v. C. B. & Q., and B. C. R. & N., refusal to make .....	1889	1055
Holman, C. J., & Bro., Sargent's Bluffs, v. C. & N.-W. et al., petition for .....	1889	1018
McGillora, L. E., Larchwood, v. B. C. R. & N. et al., refusal to apply .....	1892	862
McCarthy, M. H., Dubuque, letter of, concerning .....	1896	81
Steeves, J. C., Page Center, v. H. & S. and C. B. & Q., refusal to apply .....	1892	853
Smith, H. D., Monticello, v. Ill. Cent., refusal to apply .....	1891	763
Tims, J. B., Tama, v. O. & N.-W., refusal to grant .....	1890	934
<b>JOINT STATIONS—see, also, Ways.</b>		
And Y connections, legislation recommended .....	1889	40
At intersections, discussion of .....	1884	78
At railroad crossings .....	1884	78
Laws of Missouri and Wisconsin concerning, at crossings .....	1883	710
<b>COMPLAINTS CONCERNING AND PETITIONS FOR.</b>		
Allen Grove township, Scott county, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P. and B. C. R. & N. .....	1885	499
Brown, J. G., Marshalltown, v. Cent. Iowa and Wis., Iowa & Neb. .....	1884	562
Carnforth, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., freight facilities at .....	1889	987
Crandall, J. B., Sterling, Ill., v. C. & N.-W. and Wabash & Lohrville .....	1884	578
Crooked Creek R'd Co., union depot at Webster City .....	1893	212
Davenport, Moline & Rock Island, petition for at Wheatland .....	1887	756
Dean, George W. et al., Conway, v. H. & S. and C. B. & Q. R'd Co. .....	1884	533
Denison, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W. et al., petition of .....	1887	727

**JOINT STATIONS—Continued—**

	Year	Page
Diagonal, citizens of, v. C. St. P. & K. C. and H. & S., petition for .....	1889	1083
Donnan, Fayette county, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P. and B. C. R. & N. .....	1890	859
Fayette county, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P. et al., at Donnan Junction .....	1887	705
Goldfield, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W. and B. C. R. & N. .....	1884	536
Harrison township, Mahaska county, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W. et al. ....	1886, 607;	1887 764
Harveyville, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P. and Wabash, St. L. & P. ....	1885	500
Hawarden, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W. and C. M. & St. P. ....	1884	537
Herndon, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P. and Wabash, St. L. & P. ....	1884	538
Iowa county, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P. and O. M. & St. P. ....	1884	542
Jenks, A. M., Sheldahl, v. O. & N.-W. et al., platform crossing, etc. ....	1887	689
Jesup, Elias, et al., New Providence, v. Iowa Cent. and Toledo & N. W. R'y. ....	1885	545
Krysher, Levi, Avon, v. C. B. & Q. and C. R. I. & P., petition for .....	1886	503
Louden Machinery company, Fairfield, v. C. B. & Q. and C. G. W., petition for freight station at Afton Junction .....	1893	167
Melbourne, J. H. Bagley et al. of, v. C. G. W., joint station at crossing .....	1890	16
Malvern, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q. and Wabash, St. L. & P. ....	1884	523
Mason, E. H., Carnforth, v. C. & N.-W. and C. R. I. & P., petition for .....	1885	535
New Boston, citizens of, v. A., T. & S. F. et al. ....	1897	41
Noel, J. T., Noel, v. C. M. & St. P. and B. C. R. & N., petition for .....	1885	557
Oneida, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P. and St. P. & K. C., petition for .....	1889	1072
Palestine, trustees of, v. C. M. & St. P. and C. & N.-W. ....	1884, 513, 513.	
Reynard, J. S., Creston, v. C. B. & Q. and C. G. W., at Afton Junction .....	1893	136
Robinson, C. E., et al., Hawarden, v. C. M. & St. P. ....	1887	704
Rockwell City, citizens of, et al., v. C. & N.-W. et al., at Lohrville .....	1891	758
Romans, J. B., et al., Denison, v. C. M. & St. P. and C. & N.-W., at Arion .....	1891	742
Row, Samuel, et al., Oskaloosa, v. C. & N.-W. and Burl. & Western .....	1885	509
St. Charles, citizens of, et al., v. C. B. & Q. and C. & N.-W., near Bevington .....	1892	755
Sheldahl, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P. and C. & N.-W., petition for .....	1886	570
Sheldon, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P. et al., inadequate accommodations at .....	1897	697
ShIPLEY, H. F., et al., Herndon, v. C. M. & St. P. et al. ....	1888	708
Smith, A., et al., Conway, v. C. B. & Q. and H. & S., petition for .....	1890	854
Sule, T. R., et al., St. Charles, v. C. R. I. & P. and D. M. & O. S. ....	1887	679
Truro, citizens of, et al., v. D. M. & K. C. et al., near Bevington .....	1893	755
Walnut and Vernon townships, Palo Alto county, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N. and O. M. & St. P. ....	1889, 479;	1887 683
Warren township, citizens of, Poweshiek county, v. C. & N.-W. and C. R. I. & P. ....	1884	596
Warren township, Keokuk county, trustees of, v. C. & N.-W. and C. R. I. & P. ....	1885	578
Winterset, St. Charles and Truro, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P. and D. M. & K. C., petition for, near Bevington .....	1892	755
<b>JURISDICTION OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS—see, also, Commissioners.</b>		
of commissioners .....	1878, 5;	1891 28, 362
of commissioners in matters of private right .....	1892, 28-28,	38-39
JUST DISCRIMINATION discussed .....	1884	73
<b>KEOKUK &amp; DES MOINES RAILWAY, history of .....</b>	1879	110
<b>LACK OF CARS—see Failure to Furnish Cars; also Cars, Lack of.</b>		
<b>LACK OF DEPOT FACILITIES—see Station.</b>		
LAKES, INLAND, crossed by railroads without authority .....	1885	59
LAND GRANTS, first and final report of .....	1878, 46;	1893 12
<b>LARGE AND SMALL SHIPPERS—see Carload Rates.</b>		
LARRABEE, WILLIAM, governor, questions for commissioners' reports .....	1880	42
<b>LAW GRANTING POWER TO COMMISSIONERS—see Commissioners.</b>		
<b>LAWS AND LEGISLATION relating to railways .....</b>		
Affecting railroads discussed—see Railroad Question .....	1890 Appendix,	1890 Appendix
Amendments suggested .....	1878	32
Chronological arrangement of .....	1878	31
Conflicting and disputed provisions of .....	1889, 37;	1891 42
Decisions of court construing .....	1895	x1



LAW AND LEGISLATION—Continued—	Year	Page
In reference to automatic couplers and brakes.....	1887	59
In Iowa, affecting railroads.....	1890	Appendix
Provisions of in surrounding states.....	1895	vii
Recommendations of commissioners concerning legislation.....	1887-87-89	75
Recommended by commissioners.....	1891	42
Revisions and present status of.....	1889	37-45
Suggestions concerning amendments to law requiring reports of carriers.....	1889	xi
Uniformity in.....	1892	46
LEASES, TERMINATION OF FOR WAREHOUSES, ETC.—see <i>Sites</i> .		
LEASED ROADS, discussion of advisability of consolidating.....	1879	65
LEVIES, their maintenance by railroad companies.....	1884	85
LEWIS, DWIGHT N., elected secretary.....	1890	15
LIABILITY OF CARRIER.		
BEYOND ITS OWN LINE—see <i>Damages</i> .		
CONCERNING LIVE STOCK—see, also, <i>Lice Stock</i> .		
For care of in transit.....	1889	1050
For killing.....	1893	249
For shrinkage or of decline of market during delay in transportation.....	1892	805
Smith, J. N., Fairfield, v. O. B. & Q., shipments of without attendant.....	1883	647
FOR FAILURE TO SOUND WHISTLE AT CROSSING—see <i>Stock Killed</i> ; also, <i>Crossing—Highway</i> .		
For failures to stop at platforms.....	1891	777
FOR GOODS SHIPPED "OWNER'S RISK"—see <i>Owner's Risk</i> .		
FOR RATES QUOTED BY AGENT.....	1889	1000
Hamilton, J. M., Welda, Kan., v. O. B. & Q.....	1885	559
FROM FIRE, SUPREME COURT'S OPINION.....	1895	xxiv
see, also, <i>Fire Set Out by Engine</i> ; also, <i>Damages</i> .		
NOT EXEMPT FROM, BY CONTRACT—see <i>Owner's Risk</i> .		
Of initial carrier.....	1885	556
LIGHTING CARS.		
Discussion of.....	1890	5
Discussion of dry carburetor system.....	1892	43-44
LIMITED TICKETS, WHAT CONSTITUTES NOTICE OF LIMITATION, ETC.—see <i>Tickets</i> .		
LITERATURE, objectionable, sold on trains.....	1883	93
LITIGATION—see, also, <i>Railroad Question</i> .		
Cases pending in state courts to enforce commissioners' orders.....	1891	38
Decisions of supreme court discussed.....	1892	21, 39
In reference to commissioners' rates.....	1889	30
Report of attorney-general concerning.....	1892, 39, 40; 1893, 30; 1890, 10; 1895, 37; 1896	175
LIVE STOCK—see, also, <i>Liability of Carrier</i> .		
Brown, W. B., Wallingford, v. C. M. & St. P., delay in transit.....	1883	687
Care of when shipped.....	1887	741
Eagle, E., Onawa, v. O. & N.-W. R'y., cruelty to stock in transit.....	1884	541
IN PALACE CARS, METHODS OF REGULATING CHARGES FOR—see <i>Palace Stock Cars</i> .		
Passenger fare for attendant, with L. C. L. shipments, not authorized by commissioners' schedule.....	1897, 278, 347	
Confinement in transit, not exceeding twenty-eight hours.....	1878	56
SUBSTITUTION OF, IN TRANSIT—see <i>Stealing Live Stock in Transit</i> .		
LIVE STOCK RATES—see <i>Rates, Freight</i> .		
LOADING CARS FROM WAGONS—see, also, <i>Demurrage</i> .		
Galley, W. H., Zearing, v. Central Iowa, refusal to furnish cars for.....	1885	573
Strong & Co., Union, v. C. M. & St. P., for track shipments.....	1896	156
Time allowed for.....	1884, 525; 1889	996
LOADING AND UNLOADING L. C. L. SHIPMENTS.		
Hoebel, P., Blairstown, v. all lines, regulations concerning.....	1892	538
LOCAL FREIGHT, percentage of.....	1883, 20; 1885, 21; 1886, 20; 1887	20
LOCAL FREIGHT, TONNAGE IN IOWA, PERCENTAGE OF—see <i>Tonnage</i> .		
LOCAL RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
LOCAL TRAIN SERVICE—see <i>Train Service</i> .		
LOCAL LINES, percentage of charges received on through shipments.....	1893	33

LOCOMOTIVES, net weight of.....	Year	Page
LOGS, CLASSIFICATION OF—see <i>Classification</i> .	1879	54
LOG RATES COMPARED—see <i>Rates</i> .		
LONG AND SHORT HAUL, RATES FOR AND VIOLATION OF—see, also, <i>Rates</i> .		
Fargham & Kilbourne, Akron, v. C. M. & St. P., violation of.....	1888	695
Fowler Company, The, Waterloo, v. Ill. Cent.....	1886	485
Hogaboom, S. R., Creston, v. C. B. & Q., on hard coal.....	1895	226
Joyce, D., Carroll, v. C. M. & St. P. and C. & N.-W., on lumber.....	1894	279
Lane Implement Co., Red Oak, v. C. B. & Q., on car of implements.....	1895	175
Low rates for long haul, importance of to the state.....	1880	181
New York and other laws concerning.....	1885	55
Merrill, J. H. & Co., Ottumwa, v. K. & W., violation of.....	1889	739
Principle of referred to.....	1889	32
LOSSES BY FLOODS—see <i>Floods</i> .		
LOSSES ON THROUGH BUSINESS MADE UP BY HIGH LOCAL RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
LUMBER RATES—see <i>Rates</i> .		
LOST IN TRANSIT—see, also, <i>Damages</i> .		
Barber Med. Co., Davis City, v. C. B. & Q., carboy of vitriol.....	1892	730
Barnacle, John, Dana, v. C. R. I. & P., shortage of oats shipped to Peoria.....	1891	774
Beck, Joseph, Marcus, v. Ill. Cent., of coal.....	1889	94
Brower, D. M., Adel, v. C. B. I. & P., hogs.....	1891	534
Brown, J. V. H., Flagler, v. C. B. & Q. et al., mirror broken.....	1890	95
Bruce, J. J., Holte, v. C. & N.-W., failure to deliver goods as marked.....	1883	631
Calkins & Homan Bros., Cornish, v. C. B. & Q., stove.....	1886	611
Cary, George T., Grant, v. C. B. & Q., goods.....	1891	813
Caster & Briggs, Barnes City, v. B. O. R. & N., window broken.....	1898	80
Clark, A., Canton, v. C. & N.-W., loss of veal.....	1894	263
Conrad, Ed. A., Forest City, v. M. & St. L. and O. & N.-W., household goods.....	1894	499
Cresswell, M., Bonaparte, v. C. R. I. & P., hogs.....	1883	629
Cummings, J. M., Spencer, v. C. R. I. & P., household goods.....	1880	111
Easick, M. L., Indianola, v. C. St. P. & K. O., potatoes.....	1890	946
Fowler, C. W., Rowan, v. B. O. R. & N., veal damaged in transit.....	1895	166
Fremont Butter and Egg Co., v. C. B. & Q., car of eggs mislaid.....	1890	844
Fuller, H. E., Otho, v. Ill. Cent., box of goods.....	1888	741
Germer, Otto, Imogene, v. C. M. & St. P.....	1897	142
Georger, H., Grant, v. B. O. R. & N., household goods damaged.....	1894	534
Gross, P. P., Sibley, v. B. O. R. & N., goods.....	1892	805
Halloway, H. G., Preston, v. C. R. I. & P., steel.....	1892	834
Hartman, G. A., Creston, v. C. B. & Q., shortage of coal.....	1889	997
Healy, H. M. & Son, Grandy Center, v. B. O. R. & N., damage to flour.....	1894	258
Hebron, S., Strawberry Point, v. C. M. & St. P., damage to stock.....	1894	341
Heaton, H. J., Anderson, v. C. B. & Q., goods stolen.....	1882	459
Hurley, A. S., Cherokee, v. B. M. & O., tools.....	1887	148
Judge, J. T., Carroll, v. C. & N.-W., tent outfit.....	1885	210
Kendall, E. S., Kellerton, v. C. & N.-W., household goods.....	1882	537
Lingham, M., Van Cleave, v. Iowa Central, loss of oil on platform.....	1895	225
Luther, M. H., Swede Point, v. Ill. Cent. and O. B. & Q., household goods.....	1882	627
Martindale, J. M., Prairie City, v. C. B. & Q., box of books.....	1896	77
McFarland, C. G., of the Iowa Phonographic Co., v. Ill. Cent., goods.....	1892	866
McQuinn, James, Blencoe, v. S. O. & P., boxes of tobacco.....	1885	582
McNall, A. H., Maxwell, v. C. M. & St. P., merchandise.....	1884	501
McNall, A. H., Maxwell, v. C. M. & St. P. and W. I. & N., merchandise.....	1885	525
McNall, A. H., Maxwell, v. C. M. & St. P., barrel of sugar.....	1885	567
Phelps, P. E., Rockford, v. B. O. R. & N., flax seed.....	1895	240
Raber, John, Newberg, v. C. & N.-W., household goods.....	1882	458
Ryan, J. A., Laurens, v. C. & N.-W., loss of hogs.....	1890	940
Sokol & Kegley, Monmouth, v. C. & N.-W., damage to sorghum.....	1894	319
Southall, William & Sons, Pionser, v. C. & N.-W., of grain.....	1888	70
Spencer Bros., Randolph, v. C. B. & Q., car of coal.....	1894	449
Sturford, H. W., Grandy Center, v. B. O. R. & N., shortage in car of oats.....	1891	389
Stebbins, W. F., Decora, Ill., v. C. G. W., merchandise.....	1894	237
Stebbins, W. F., Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., household goods.....	1896	127



## LOST IN TRANSIT—Continued—

Van Norman, J., Mobile, v. C. R. I. & P. et al., merchandise.....	1895	161
Vetter, D., Grant, v. C. B. & Q., oilcloth.....	1891	731
Warnstaff, N., Grand River, v. B. & M. et al., merchandise.....	1888	679
Whittier, L., Whiting, v. S. C. & P. and C. & N.-W., merchandise.....	1883	584
Witmer, F. R. & Son, Mingo, v. C. St. P. & K. C., goods stolen.....	1890	876
Wood, Alfred, Traer, v. C. M. & St. P. and B. C. R. & N.....	1882	532

MAIL FACILITIES AND MAIL SERVICE—see *Station Service*, also *Train Service*.

MAPLE RIVER RAILROAD, history of.....	1879	111
MARKED CAPACITY OF CARS.....		

France, H. C., Rose Hill, v. C. R. I. & P., rule governing.....	1897	135
MARKETS, CHOICE OF SHIPPERS ENTITLED TO—see <i>Rights of Shippers</i> .....		
MARKS, M. L., testimony of, in Davenport rate cases.....	1888	761
MASSACHUSETTS, attitude of, concerning grade crossings.....	1893	16
MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM RATES, discussion of.....	1885	53
MAXIMUM RATES, opinion of supreme court concerning, discussed.....	1897	9
MAXIMUM RATES, in Davenport, Dubuque and Burlington rate cases.....	1888, 752, 773, 797	
McCLAIN, EMLIN, "Statutes of Iowa relating to railways".....	1890	3

## MILEAGE.

Comparative table of, 1878 to 1899 inclusive.....	1899	6
Increase in Iowa discussed.....	1891, 5;	1898
Iowa, fifth of the states in.....	1891	5
In Iowa, table of.....	1879	128
Of road built from earnings in excess of 6 per cent on \$30,000 per mile.....	1891	37
Proportion of earnings credited to branch lines.....	1889	1006

## MILEAGE BOOK.

Hultz, Webb, Chariton, Iowa Central, claim for rebate on.....	1890	851
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Dey.....	1890	851
Nash, C. J., Ottumwa, v. Wabash, C. R. I. & P. et al., refusal to honor.....	1886	575
Pollans, F. E., Waterloo, v. Ill. Cent., use of by other than purchaser.....	1897	134

## MILLING IN TRANSIT.

Application of principle to barbed wire.....	1887	715
Edmonds, E. J., Marcus, v. Illinois Central, cleaning grain in transit.....	1893	252
Tiede, A. C. & Co., Elkport, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1892	850

## MINIMUM CHARGE.

Barnard Bros., Ackley, v. Central Iowa, 25-cent charge.....	1880	19
Iowa Jobbers v. All Railroads, attempted advance, 25c to 50c.....	1894	335
Parker, S. F., Earlville, v. C. & N.-W.....	1882	457

## MINIMUM WEIGHT.

Brown, W. S., Manson, v. Ill. Cent.....	1896	61
---	------	----

## MINIMUM WEIGHT AND MARKED CAPACITY OF CAR.

Brown, J. G., Marshalltown, v. C. M. & St. P., charges for excess.....	1887	718
Codd, H. G. S., Westfield, v. C. & N.-W., on live stock.....	1890	260
Dunlap, J. H., Clarinda, v. C. B. & Q., on wagons, parts of.....	1887	750
Des Moines Lined Oil works v. Illinois Central, on flax seed.....	1895	218
DuBois, W. S., Rockwell City, v. C. M. & St. P., marked capacity of car.....	1899	124
France, H. C., Rose Hill, v. C. R. I. & P., rule governing marked capacity of cars.....	1897	135
Hollingsworth, A. E., Dunreath, v. Ill. Cent., coal.....	1899	61
Leonard, Daniel, Corning, v. All Railroads, on car of sheep.....	1894	159
Ketchum & Johnson Co., Marshalltown, v. C. & N.-W., agricultural implements.....	1897	108
McGrath, J., Tyrone, v. C. B. & Q., of coal.....	1892	885
Morris, Daniel, Lawn Hill, v. C. & N.-W., of carloads.....	1882	459
Pearson & Hayton, Pierson, v. C. & N.-W., grain.....	1899	95
Mt. Pleasant Milling Co. v. C. B. & Q., on flour.....	1899	98
Sheldon, H. C., Tingley, v. C. B. & Q., on sheep in carloads.....	1895	201
Slife, M., Dedham, v. C. M. & St. P., marked capacity of cars.....	1899	124
Townsend, D. W., Cherokee v. Ill. Cent., estimating weight of brick.....	1899	84
MINK, OLIVER W., comptroller, letter of, in Council Bluffs complaint.....	1885	545

## MISCELLANEOUS.

Adams, E. E., Britt, v. C. I. & D. R. R. Co., compensation for printing.....	1886	515
Astor, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., location of new town near Astor.....	1886	589
Brown, A. F., Newton, v. Central Iowa, failure to run Odd Fellows' train.....	1888	730
Carlson, S. G., Stratford, v. C. & N.-W., rental for site for scales.....	1893	21
Casselman, J. H., Ames, v. C. St. P. M. & O., claim for lost mileage book.....	1892	842
Davis, et al., Sanborn, v. C. M. & St. P., unsanitary caboose.....	1896	92
Dow & Mercer, McVeigh, v. Ft. M. & N.-W., withholding of freight.....	1884	500
Expenses in constructing spur track, parties entitled to return of, on abandonment of track.....	1891	738
Gillespie, Mrs. B., Chadron, v. C. B. & Q., refund for ticket stolen.....	1889	1056
Indebtedness of railway companies, law concerning.....	1884	77
Jones, F. C., Herndon, v. D. M. & N.-W. et al., storing cars on Y track.....	1892	850
Paralta, Linn county, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., highway to depot.....	1892	814
Randall, L. D. & Co., Dubuque, v. Illinois Central, division of territory between railroads.....	1881	132
Slosson, J. M., Northwood, v. B. C. R. & N., feeding snow-bound passengers.....	1883	674
Spre, William J., Barnes City, v. C. R. I. & P., misconduct of train men.....	1892	856
Valentine, H. K., Casey, v. United States Express Co., claim for perishable goods shipped with charges guaranteed.....	1892	847

MISQUOTED RATES BY AGENTS, LIABILITY OF CARRIERS FOR—see *Liability*.MIXED CARLOADS—see *Carloads*.MIXED TRAIN SERVICE—see *Train Service*.

MONOPOLY of shipping facilities on station grounds against public policy.....	1890, 893-895; 1891, 736, 814; 1892	781
MORGAN, E. G., appointed secretary of the board.....	1880	3
Resigned.....	1887	8

## NATIONAL CONVENTION of railroad commissioners..... 1881 164

NAVIGATION, OBSTRUCTION OF—see *Obstruction and Overflow*.NEGLECT IN CARE OF STATION—see *Station*.

NEW LINES, construction of.....	1898	6
---------------------------------	------	---

NIGHT STATION SERVICE—see *Station*.NORTHWOOD CASE—see, also *Abandonment of Road*.

Certified to attorney-general.....	1884	45
NUISANCE.....		
Woman's Village Imp. Co., Coon Rapids, v. C. M. & St. P., unsightly piles of dirt.....	1897	105

OBSTRUCTING STREETS AND HIGHWAY CROSSINGS—see also, *Crossing, Highway*.

Dodd, F. B., Waunakee, v. C. M. & St. P., with standing trains.....	1896	111
Gafford, Joseph, Burlington, v. Citizens of Murray, by elevator.....	1887	687
Barney, B., mayor of Meservey, v. M. C. & Ft. D., street with cars.....	1896	153
Johnson and Erickson, Pickering, v. C. M. & St. P., by fence.....	1893	209
Lee, L. W., Wick, v. C. G. W., by standing train.....	1898	80
Le Mars, citizens of, v. Ill. Cent.....	1890, 861, 889	
Murchison, A. S., Williamsburg, v. C. M. & St. P., by trains.....	1886	517
Murray, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., at highway crossing.....	1886	565
Murray, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., protest of Joseph Gafford.....	1887	687
Ochiltree, T. J., Morning Sun, v. B. C. R. & N., blockading streets.....	1884	585
Roley, T. T., Keswick, v. B. C. R. & N., by standing train.....	1896	136
Russell, J. M., Storm Lake, v. Ill. Cent., by elevator.....	1893	154
Thomas, A. D., Fredericksburg, v. C. G. W., streets across station grounds.....	1893	156
Turner, et al., Colfax, v. C. R. I. & P., by train.....	1893	210
Waters, James, Des Moines, v. C. & N.-W., with cars.....	1892	832
Wyatt, E. R., et al., Lamolite, v. C. & N.-W., with train.....	1886	554
Zeidler, J. C., Mallard, v. C. R. I. & P., by building and platform.....	1893	165

## OBSTRUCTION AND OVERFLOW.

Amundson, H., Ellsworth, v. C. & N.-W., watercourse and highway.....	1888	738
Anderson, A. A. et al., Okoboji, v. C. M. & St. P., navigation.....	1892	741
Armstrong, J. R., road supervisor, Marion, v. C. M. & St. P., watercourse.....	1894	246
Barnholdt, Clause, Wiota, v. C. R. I. & P., lack of culverts.....	1890, 951; 1894	328



	Year	Page
<b>OBSTRUCTION AND OVERFLOW—Continued—</b>		
Bebee, J. W., Talmage, v. C. G. W., waste water from tank.....	1892, 857;	1893 210
Boal, John, et al., Mitchellville, v. C. R. I. & P., insufficient drainage.....	1897	144
Campbell, J. S. K., Morning Sun, v. Iowa Cent. drainage.....	1896	172
Craig, W. F., et al., Davis City v. C. B. & Q., of watercourse.....	1890	879
Crozier, C. E., Oskaloosa, v. B. & W. and C. & N.-W., of watercourse.....	1890	860
C. R. I. & P. Ry' Co. v. C. B. & Q. at grade railroad crossing.....	1887	735
Donner, J. D., et al., Marshalltown, v. W. I. & N., by defective construction.....	1887	713
Eldon drainage case.....	1895	125
Fortney, David, Otho, v. M. & St. L., refusal to lower culvert.....	1885	551
Giles, Charles, Talmage, v. C. B. & Q., of waterway.....	1890	845
Greenwood township, trustees of, Bancroft, v. C. & N.-W., of watercourse.....	1894	343
Guthrie county, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., near Bagley.....	1893	142
Harding, N. G., Des Moines, v. D. M. N. & W. al., drainage.....	1897	87
Hendrie, J. S., et al., Pacific Junction, v. C. B. & Q., of creek.....	1884, 509,	874
Huxley, citizens of, by O. L. Hattberg, v. C. M. & St. P., of watercourse.....	1890	230
Insels, W. H., et al., Emmetsburg, v. B. C. R. & N., navigation.....	1886	474
Jenks, A. N., Sheldahl, v. C. & N.-W., by surface water.....	1885	579
Kelly, W. F., Decatur county, v. D. M. & K. O., damages, on account of.....	1890	885
Kendall, W. T., et al., Spirit Lake, v. C. M. & St. P., navigation.....	1885	491
Kline, George, Glidden, v. C. & N.-W., insufficient waterway.....	1891	771
Koons, J. H., Des Moines, v. C. G. W., drainage.....	1895	152
Lange, A., Froelich, v. C. M. & St. P., insufficient drainage.....	1892	822
Leatina, F., Froelich, v. C. M. & St. P., highway crossing.....	1897	119
Lewis, J. F., New Hampton, v. C. G. W., damage on account of.....	1893	203
McConnell, T. D., Rota, v. C. & N.-W., from embankment.....	1896	129
McNaughton, M. N., Villisca, v. C. B. & Q., stock drowned.....	1887	766
Mitchell, L., Blairsburg, v. Ill. Cent., drainage.....	1895, 197;	1896 57
Moore, Thomas, et al., Turin, v. C. & N.-W., arbitration.....	1889, 999,	1002
Powell, Charles, et al., Bagley, v. C. M. & St. P., damage by reason of.....	1893	142
Rick, James G., Granger, v. D. M. N. & W., defective drainage.....	1897	113
Rodgers, G. W., Fort Dodge, v. C. & N.-W., petition to drain excavation.....	1895	534
Shophell, Henry, Mt. Union, v. B. & N. W., damage caused by.....	1893	654
Simmons, C. H., Mapleton, v. C. M. & St. P., drainage.....	1899	83
Smith, E. J., North English, v. C. M. & St. P., improper drainage.....	1892	832
Terry, J. L., Martelle, v. C. M. & St. P., of watercourse.....	1892	740
Tibbets, D., Miles, et al., v. C. R. I. & P., drainage near Eldon.....	1895	125
Turner, James R., Wiota, v. C. R. I. & P., insufficient drain pipe.....	1891	790
Wilcox, J. A., Sanborn, v. C. M. & St. P., of watercourse.....	1893	230
Wright, W. H. H., Dunlap, v. C. & N.-W., insufficient drainage.....	1889	89
Yungles, J. H., Dancombe, v. Ill. Cent., of highway.....	1885	545
Yungles, J. H., Webster City, v. Ill. Cent., defective culvert.....	1883	567
<b>OFFICERS' SALARIES.....</b>	1888	645
<b>OMNIBUS PRIVILEGES.</b>		
Anderson, P. G., & Son, Mason City, v. C. M. & St. P., discrimination in.....	1895	222
Beach, W. H., Goldfield, v. R'y Co's., refused to allow him.....	1898	87
Cloze, George V., Iowa Falls, v. B. C. R. & N. et al., discrimination in.....	1892	763
Hackman, J. W., City v. R'y Companies, discrimination in.....	1890	851
Smith, et al., Manilla, v. C. M. & St. P., hotel runners at stations.....	1888	667
Stalker, J. W., Iowa Falls, v. Illinois Central, discrimination.....	1897	129
Thomassen, John G., Pella, v. C. R. I. & P., discrimination in.....	1890	903
Todd, J. B., Manilla, v. C. M. & St. P., privileges of hotel runners at stations.....	1894	277
Van Houser, F. and C., Cedar Falls, v. Ill. Cent., discrimination in.....	1881	135
<b>OPERATING EXPENSES.</b>		
Must be met by earnings.....	1880	178
Percentage of different classes of.....	1880	172
<b>OPERATORS, TELEGRAPH, PETITION FOR—see Station.</b>		
<b>ORDERS OF COMMISSIONERS, their nature should be specific, instead of advisory:</b>		
option by supreme court.....	1892	21, 39
<b>OVER-CAPITALIZATION—see Watered Stock.</b>		
<b>OVERCHARGE ON SAND—see Rates.</b>		
<b>OVERCHARGE IN PASSENGER FARES—see Passenger Fares.</b>		

## OVERCHARGE.

	Year	Page
Allen, D. P., Carroll, v. C. M. & St. P. et al. on car of junk.....	1880	1055
Amos, T. B., Essex, v. C. B. & Q., on calves.....	1887	752
Archie, W. F., Spencer, v. C. M. & St. P., refund ordered.....	1881	137
Arnold, J. M., Davis City, v. C. B. & Q., on posts.....	1888	731
Aye, Rolf, Grundy Center, v. B., C. R. & N., on timothy seed.....	1895	224
Banks, J. A., Cooper, v. D. M. N. & W., on threshing engine for repairs.....	1892	834
Barber, Ed., Glidden, v. C. & N.-W., in rate on buggy.....	1896	49, 69
Barr, S. P., Eagle Grove, v. M. C. & P. D., on empty baskets.....	1887	824
Barrett & Son, Mount Vernon, v. C. & N.-W., on corn.....	1887	689
Bathe, G. R., Tuskegee, v. C. B. & Q., on cars of hogs.....	1889	1054
Baxter, J. W., Lewis, v. C. O. R. I. & P., on live stock.....	1883	833
Beach, C. L., Stratton, Neb., v. M. & St. L., error in quoting rates.....	1886	612
Blanchard, D. A., Adel, v. C. & N.-W. et al., on wagons.....	1887	690
Blanchard, D. A., Adel, v. D. M. N. & W., on buggy, interstate.....	1896	93
Borum, S. H., Des Moines, v. C. B. & Q. and D. M. N. & W., on billiard tables.....	1896	123
Bowers, Charles, Quincy, Ill., v. C. R. I. & P., on ticket.....	1892	843
Bunker & Hazard, Newell, v. Ill. Cent. al., on agricultural feed steamer.....	1891	770
Bussard, J. & Co., Imogene, v. Wabash, refund of.....	1894	497
Breezley, W. H., Kelly, v. C. & N.-W. et al., refusal of joint rates.....	1892	846
Brent, L. H., Weston, v. C. & N.-W., erroneous classification.....	1882	511
Brockway, E. F., Alinsworth, v. C. R. I. & P., on live stock, etc.....	1888	682
Brown, C. M., Anamosa, v. B. C. R. & N. and C. M. & St. P., on heifer.....	1883	533
Brown, W. S., Manassah, v. Ill. Cent., marked capacity of car.....	1896	61
Brown, J. G., Marshalltown, v. C. M. & St. P., on account of.....	1876	718
Brown, L. A., of Jeffersville & Brown, Davis City, v. C. B. & Q., on apples.....	1891	772
Canfield, Charles, Esterville, v. C. M. & St. P., on household goods.....	1893	667
Carpenter, D. J., Beloit, v. C. O. M. & St. P., on account of applying interstate rates to state commerce.....	1890	849
Carpenter & Genung, Independence, v. C. B. & Q., on horse power.....	1889	995
Carroll, E. L., Adel, v. D. M. N. & W., on wheat.....	1881	133
Carroll, T. R., Plainfield, v. Ill. Cent., on coal.....	1893	493
Chambers, S. E., Corwith, v. C. R. I. & P., on wagons.....	1888	499
Clarke, O. J., Sibley, v. C. St. P. M. & O., on merchandise.....	1888	715
Cline & Bennett, Meriden, v. Ill. Cent., incorrect weight on lumber.....	1883	698
Cline, J., Reasoner, v. C. R. I. & P., on live stock.....	1888	730
Cochran, Robert, Audubon, v. B. C. R. & N. on bull.....	1884	540
Codd, H. G. S., Westfield, v. C. & N.-W., on live stock.....	1894	290
Cole, J. L., Son, Greene, v. B. C. R. & N., on wall paper.....	1884	624
Conroy, P. T., Walnut, v. C. R. I. & P., on stock cattle.....	1894	97
Cooper, A. A., Dubuque, v. C. M. & St. P., on wagons.....	1881	138
Cooper, A. M., Tracy, v. C. B. & Q., on car of corn.....	1896	76
Corwin, J. H., Dedham, v. B. C. R. & N., et al., on household goods.....	1889	1048
Cox, J. R., Dexter, v. C. O. & N.-W. and C. R. I. & P., on threshing outfit.....	1892	845
Crandall & Eyer, Webster City, v. Ill. Cent., on spring wagons.....	1881	132
Cresswell, John, Bonaparte, v. C. Ft. M. & D. M., on stock cattle, interstate.....	1890	125
Crosby, C. F., South English, v. C. R. I. & P., passenger fare.....	1879	25
Danaham, W. E., Albia, v. C. B. & Q., on wagon, on fence posts.....	1889	301
Dammer, Wm., Newton, v. C. R. I. & P., refund of overcharge.....	1896	149
Darby, J. H., Belmond, v. C. M. & St. P., failure to apply joint rates on hogs.....	1895	203
Davis, J. E., Coin, v. C. M. & St. P., on household goods.....	1895	163
Denton, Robert, Iowa City, v. C. R. I. & P., on bull.....	1884	647
Des Moines Lined Oil Works v. Ill. Cent., charges on marked capacity of car.....	1895	218
Dickey, William G., Maxwell, v. C. St. P. & K. O. et al., on coal.....	1887	779
Downing, W. E., Selma, v. C. B. & K. O. et al., on lumber.....	1888	733
Dunlap, J. H., Clarinda, v. C. B. & Q., on wagon.....	1887	750
Dunlap, W. E., Alliance, Neb., v. C. M. & St. P., refund of bridge toll.....	1894	310
Earle, W. O., Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., stock in Ames palace car.....	1888	834
Ellis, G. M., Emmetsburg, v. C. M. & St. P., on sulky.....	1889	998
Ellyson, Zed, West Liberty, v. B. C. R. & N., on horse.....	1886	511
Fairchild, E., Chester, v. C. M. & St. P., on horses, interstate.....	1899	106
Ferguson, T. W., Dallas Center, v. C. R. I. & P., on roll of harness leather.....	1888	690



## OVERCHARGE—Continued—

Foster, T. M., North English, v. B. C. R. & N., drugs.....	1899	68
Fowler, L. M., Watkins, v. C. & N.-W., on light top buggy.....	1898	677
Freeman, F. M., Davis City, v. American Express Co., on two dogs.....	1892	854
Frizzell, Thomas, Malcom, v. C. R. I. & P., on smoke stack.....	1892	853
Fuller, J. W., Kellerton, v. C. B. & Q., on hardware.....	1887	761
Garvin, William, Marcus, v. Ill. Cent., on horse power.....	1880	848
Garvin, William, Marcus, v. Ill. Cent., on corn.....	1894	236
Giant Coal Co., Des Moines, v. C. & N.-W., on coal.....	1885	504
Gilbert, E. H., Okaloosa, v. C. B. & Q. & B. & Western, on merchandise.....	1885	519
Gibbs, H. A., Estherville, v. B. C. R. & N., on car of coal.....	1889	1060
Gillespie, J. T., Nevada, v. C. & N.-W., overweight on empty barrels.....	1889	996
Golden, O. M., Kellogg, v. C. R. I. & P., shipment of seeds.....	1888	732
Gooch, N. L., Avon, v. C. & N.-W., emigrant movables.....	1896	51
Goodsell, L., Fortus Falls, Minn., v. B. C. R. & N., in passenger fare.....	1888	617
Griffin, E. A., Tekamah, Neb., v. C. M. & St. P., on household goods.....	1891	772
Griffin, Patrick, Grand River, v. H. & S., on car of corn.....	1888	680
Groneweg & Schoentgen, Council Bluffs, v. K. C. St. J. & C. B.....	1888, 533	693
Guthrie, S. C., Webster City, v. Ill. Cent., on oil tank wagon.....	1888	745
Hale, W. C., Wellman, v. C. R. I. & P., on car of oats.....	1887	761
Hall, O. E., Glenwood, Neb., v. C. B. & Q., on bull.....	1884	544
Hadley, A. J., Deltay, Col., v. C. R. I. & P. and D. & G., on household goods.....	1887	81
Hall, Truman, Bedford, v. C. M. & St. P., on car of goods.....	1896	65
Hamilton, J. M., Welda, Kas., v. B. C. & Q., on bull.....	1885	569
Hershey Lumber Co., Muscatine, v. B. C. R. & N., on lumber, change of rates without notice.....	1883	565
Hershey, L. G., Earlville, v. Ill. Cent., on five cars of corn.....	1887	713
Hill, F. W., Maxwell, v. C. M. & St. P., on flour from Waterloo to Melbourne.....	1888	681
Hog, J. M., Maquoketa, v. C. M. & St. P., on car of ponies for sale fair.....	1889	1063
Holmes, Jos., Marshalltown, v. C. & N.-W., on car of apples.....	1891	737
Hoopes, T. J., Eugene, v. C. B. & Q., on household goods and lumber.....	1892	467
Hornaday, C. A., Udell, v. C. M. & St. P., on hay press, Interstate.....	1898	88
Hoyt, M. A. & Bro., Carroll, v. C. & N.-W.....	1879	28
Hughes, J. C., Norwalk, v. D. M. & K. C., on logs.....	1897	88
Hunna, A., Abingdon, v. O. R. I. & P., household goods, Interstate.....	1892	721
Hupp, John, et al., v. O. R. I. & P., on live stock.....	1888	73
Hulbert, L. E., et al., Fort Dodge, v. C. M. & St. L., on coal.....	1881	141
Hutchcroft & Co., Kossuth, v. B. C. R. & N., on slack coal.....	1889	1003
Id, Lewis, Painesville, v. C. & N.-W., on ship's cargo.....	1887	691
Jackman, A., Tama City, v. U. I. P., on mixed car of live stock.....	1893	564
Japp, Gust., Rosedale, v. C. R. I. & P. & C. & N.-W., on horse power.....	1891	1041
Jennings, F., Rose Hill, v. C. R. I. & P. et al., live stock.....	1898	43
Jergens, Fred, Evely, v. O. M., & St. P., on household goods.....	1896	98
Jickling, William, Ira, v. O. G. W., on buggy.....	1894	239
Johnson, J. F., Paton, v. C. R. I. & P., on car of horses.....	1893	634
Johnson, J. F., Oak, v. Central Iowa, on live stock.....	1884, 519	497
Johnston, A., Tingley, v. H. & S., et al., on coal.....	1888	678
Jones, T. B., Beaconsfield, v. C. B. & Q., two minimum.....	1899	111
Keeffe, James, Ft. Dodge, v. M. & St. L., on coal.....	1891	991
Keeffe, James, Ft. Dodge, v. M. & St. L., on coal.....	1891	991
Kelley, J. W., Osceola, v. C. B. & Q., on lime.....	1890	17
Knovies, C. B., Glenwood, v. C. B. & Q., on cow.....	1898	53
Knovies, W. F., Sioux City, v. Ill. Cent., on light, bulky package.....	1882	450
Knovies, W. H., James, v. American Express Co., on small package.....	1891	771
Knowlton Mfg. Co., Rockford, Ill., v. C. B. & Q., on implements.....	1885	547
Kreutzer & Wassen, Marshalltown, v. C. M. & St. P., on lumber.....	1881	353
Krueger, C. F., Des Moines, v. C. & N.-W., on household goods.....	1884	252
LaGrange, J. H., Storm Lake, v. Ill. Cent., on junk to Chicago.....	1897	68
Lane Implement Co., Red Oak, v. C. B. & Q., on short haul.....	1895	175
Leech, James, Derby, v. C. B. & Q., on bob-sleds.....	1887	696
Leeper, J. E. & Co., Pleasanton, v. C. B. & Q., et al., petition for refund.....	1889	1013
Leimkuhler, F., Moscow, v. C. R. I. & P., on binding twine.....	1897	117

## OVERCHARGE—continued—

Looker, J. K. M., Bonaparte, v. C. R. I. & P., emigrant movables.....	1891	825
Lummls, W. D. F., Perry, v. C. & N.-W., on iron safe.....	1885	534
Marshall, Ed., Casey, v. C. R. I. & P., on household goods.....	1894	293
Mathews, E., Randallia, v. B. C. R. & N., mixed car of live stock.....	1893	824
McDonald & Co., D. H. & Co., Iowa City, v. B. C. R. & N., on dead hogs.....	1888	585
McDonald, G. W., Dysart, v. B. C. R. & N., traffic from point to point in Iowa though passing outside the state in transit, is state commerce.....	1892	863
McKay, F. D., Adel, v. D. M. N. & W., on coal.....	1897	115
McKinley, Geo. F., St. Ansgar, v. B. C. R. & N., on household goods.....	1905	204
Meade, S. K., Rockwell City, v. D. M. N. & W., on butter and eggs.....	1888	691
Meade, S. K., Rockwell City, v. D. M. N. & W., on salt and other merchandise.....	1889, 699, 1029	
Miller, H. O., Corydon, v. H. & S., on car of corn.....	1887	793
Miller, John, Waukon, v. O. M. & St. P., on broom corn.....	1892	830
Moore & Gill, Kansas City, v. K. C. St. J. & C. B., on car of merchandise.....	1883	676
Moore, N., Van Meter, v. C. R. I. & P., on wheat to Chicago.....	1897	58
Moran & McManus, Adair, v. C. R. I. & P., on merchandise.....	1885	550
Morris, Daniel, Lawn Hill, v. C. & N.-W., minimum carload.....	1882	459
Murray, Geo. P., Wiota, v. C. M. & St. P., on emigrant movables.....	1891	773
Nichols, Pliny, West Liberty, v. C. R. I. & P., on stock for fairs.....	1881, 141	1884
Nicholson, H., Maple River Junction, v. C. & N.-W., on emigrant movables.....	1890	710
Norton, G. W., Durant, v. C. R. I. & P. and C. M. & St. P., on live stock.....	1883	724
Nye, J. P., Essex, v. C. B. & Q., on corn.....	1883	783
Nye & Bourne, Grand Center, v. B. C. R. & N., excessive rates.....	1883	784
Ormsby, A. L., Emmetsburg, v. B. C. R. & N., on carriage, Interstate.....	1896	99
Owens, A., Carlisle, v. C. B. & Q., excessive freight charges.....	1894	543
Pearson & Hayton, Pierson, v. C. & N.-W., grain.....	1899	95
Persons, B. D., Blencoe, v. C. & N.-W. et al., on car of posts.....	1889	1033
Plummer, J. W. & Son, New Hartford, v. Ill. Cent., apples, Interstate.....	1898	41
Powers, T. B., Scranton, v. C. & N.-W., live stock and agricultural implements.....	1891	769
Preston, F. B., Adel, v. D. M. N. & W., on empty egg cases.....	1891	780
Radwisch, S., Davis City, v. C. B. & Q., passenger fare.....	1888	750
Rassonier, Mrs. H. M., Reasoner, v. C. R. I. & P., on live stock.....	1889	1066
Redhead, George S., Des Moines, v. D. M. & K. C., on young bulls.....	1896	96
Reinberger & Schroeder, Des Moines, v. C. & N.-W., on furniture, K. D.....	1886	814
Renken & Tammam, Parkersburg, v. Ill. Cent. on brick in carloads.....	1891	691
Riburn, Thomas, New Albion, v. C. M. & St. P., on car.....	1884	532
Risley, T. E. D., Shenandoah, v. C. B. & Q., on horse, lack of joint rates.....	1895	150
Ritchie, W. B. & Son, Muscatine, v. B. C. R. & N., et al., on car of oats.....	1888	588
Ripley Coal Co., Ripley, v. C. M. & St. P., on coal.....	1889	1036
Roberts, F., Coon Rapids, v. C. B. & Q., on account of overweight.....	1898	83
Roberts, J. & Co., Columbus, Neb., v. C. B. & Q., on shelled corn.....	1884	547
Rogers, Warren, Marathon, v. C. & N.-W., on emigrant movables.....	1888	722
Rosegrant, S. C., Galva, v. C. & N.-W., on oil meal.....	1898	511
Rosenberg, Isaac, Traer, v. B. C. R. & N., on merchandise.....	1883	689
Sauer, W. H., Ackley, v. Ill. Cent., on marble.....	1885	635
Schenk, Walter, Burlington, v. C. M. & St. P., on passenger ticket.....	1885	628
Scott, O. B., Peterson, v. U. S. Ex. Co., organ.....	1896	42
Shearer, F. W., Ida Grove, v. C. & N.-W., on telephone poles.....	1884	857
Sheldon, H. O., Tingley, v. C. B. & Q., minimum weight on sheep.....	1893	701
Shultz, H. E., Dows, v. B. C. R. & N., on show case.....	1884	533
Smith, E. H., Dubuque, v. Ill. Cent., et al., goods for state fair.....	1898	73
Smith, E. R., et al., Fairfield, v. C. R. I. & P., on live stock.....	1886	505
Smith, H. U., New Hartford, v. Ill. Cent., on household goods.....	1884	563
Smith, H. D., Monticello, v. C. M. & St. P., on feed.....	1882	563
Smith, H. D., Monticello, v. Ill. Cent., et al., joint rates refused.....	1891	762
Smith, S., et al., New Market, v. St. L. K. & N. W., on household goods.....	1886	609
Smith & Shaul, Quincy, v. K. C. St. J. & C. B., on car of apples.....	1890	698
Starlin, John, Missouri Valley, v. Wabash, on stone.....	1896	498
Steer, William M., West Branch, v. B. C. R. & N. Ry Co., on coal.....	1884	591
Steeves, J. O., Page Center, v. H. & S. & D. & B. & Q., joint rates refused.....	1892	852



	YEAR	PAGE
Tasker, Thomas G., Onslow, v. C. & N.-W., on corn.....	1887	728
Tasker, K. S., Onslow, v. C. M. & St. L., on corn to Chicago.....	1896	361
Taylor, H. L., East Peru, v. C. B. & Q. et al., on emigrant movables.....	1893	211, 223
Teal, C., Ochevedan, v. B. C. R. & N., on general merchandise.....	1885	549
Tennessee Cedar and Timber Co., Wanamaker, v. C. B. & Q. et al., on account of stakes on cars.....	1898	58
Thomas, A. E., Des Moines, v. C. B. & Q., on cow.....	1887	791
Tuttle, L., Lawrence, Kan., v. M. & St. L., on hay.....	1886	498
Vorse, F. W., Des Moines, v. M. & St. L., on agricultural implements.....	1884	545
Voss, Fred, Logan, v. C. & N.-W., on live stock.....	1889	109
Wagner, Phil, Des Moines, v. C. & N.-W., on emigrant movables.....	1891	669
Watson, Mrs., Sioux City, v. K. C. St. J. & C. B. et al., on household goods.....	1893	163
Watson, J. A., Hull, v. C. M. & St. P., on emigrant movables, interstate.....	1896	129
Webb, Henry, Kew, v. C. B. & Q., exorbitant rates.....	1893	623
Weir, H. C., Mt. Pleasant, v. C. B. & Q., on live stock by weight.....	1889	1049
Weir, R. H., Winthrop, Dak., v. B. C. R. & N., on household goods.....	1885	593
Wells, Geo., Bank, Germania, v. B. C. R. & N., grain to Chicago.....	1898	55
Weston, F. E., Carroll, v. C. & N.-W., on hay.....	1898	50
Williams Imp. Co., Dubuque, v. B. C. R. & N., goods not shipped O. R.....	1884	528
Williams, R. B., Keb, v. C. B. & Q., on house.....	1897	65
Wilson, J. C., Harper, v. C. R. I. & P., on carriage.....	1892	844
Wilson, E. L., Turo, v. C. G. W., on buggy.....	1896	117
Wiss Bros., Alta, v. Ill. Cent., on live stock prior to acceptance of commissioners' rates and pending injunction proceedings.....	1894	382
Wiswell, E. R., Rolfe, v. C. & N.-W., on hay.....	1888	718
Witham, J. W., Des Moines, v. D. M. & K. C., in passenger fare.....	1892	840
Wright, W. T., Oskaloosa, v. C. & N.-W. et al., on passenger ticket.....	1887	732
Yakzy, E. H., Audubon, v. B. C. R. & N., on emigrant movables.....	1885	583
Yocum, A., et al., Van Cleave, v. C. St. P. & K. C., tickets to state fair.....	1889	1961
Young, Charles, Taintor, v. Iowa Cent., on emigrant movables.....	1921	756
Zanga, H. A., Ottumwa, v. B. C. & K. C., on whiskey.....	1884	598
OVERCHARGE, refunded in case of violation of long and short haul clause.....	1894	270
OVER-CROSSING—see Crossing.		
OVERFLOW—see Drainage, Damages, Obstruction.		
OVERSHIPMENT AND CONTROL OF RAILROADS BY GOVERNMENT—see Government.		
OWNER'S RISK.		
Contract exempting common carrier from liability not authorized by law.....	1892	415
Law concerning.....	1894, 628, 1892	831
COMPLAINANTS CONCERNING.		
Campbell, Daniel, Blencoe, v. S. C. & P. and C. & N.-W., damages.....	1892	465
Crawford, W. H., Hampton, v. Iowa Cent., on bulk flaxseed.....	1881	138
Erickson, C. A., Moservey, v. M. C. & Ft. D., released shipments.....	1892	831
Shanks & Coats, West Mitchell, v. C. B. & Q. et al.....	1893	553
Walton, Charles, Paton, v. C. R. I. & P., damages for breakage.....	1890	878
Williams Imp. Co., Dubuque, v. B. C. R. & N., carrier's liability unaffected.....	1884	528
Williams, W. L., Corning, v. C. B. & Q., in shipments of dairy products.....	1886	510
PALACE STOCK CARS.		
Fields & Bro., W. M., Cedar Falls, v. all lines, extra charge for.....	1892	839
PASSENGERS CARRIED ON FREIGHT TRAINS—see Train Service.		
PASSENGER FARES.		
Discussed at national convention of commissioners.....	1891	30, 35
In New York.....	1878	52
Reduction of discussed.....	1887, 475, 1889	42
With reference to improved condition of roads.....	1891	25
Ten cents extra on failure to purchase ticket—see, also, <i>Refusion from Train</i> .....	1891	780
COMPLAINANTS CONCERNING.		
Armour, Volney, Livermore, v. M. & St. L., extra fare paid on train.....	1892	835
Baker, T. M., Cumming, v. C. G. W., excessive passenger fare.....	1894	235
Bradford, W. E., Britt, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive passenger rates.....	1883	712
Crosby, C. F., South English, v. O. R. I. & P., excessive.....	187	27

## OVERCHARGE—continued—

	YEAR	PAGE
Carl, C. E., Bloomfield, v. C. B. & Q., advertised excursion rates refused.....	1883	537
Cade, B. C., Carroll, v. C. & N.-W., on railway ticket.....	1897	49
Dammer, William, Newton, v. C. R. I. & P., not part of freight charges.....	1894, 335, 1895	193
Danner, W. W., Des Moines, for Holiness Association, camp meeting rates.....	1894, 335, 1895	193
Day, Homer, Bly thedale, Mo., v. C. B. & Q., fare paid on train.....	1892	823
Frazier, J. S., Nevada, v. C. & N.-W., overcharge on account of longest route.....	1897	121
Harris, A., Avoca, v. C. R. I. & P., overcharge in.....	1881	127
Herring, I., Des Moines, v. C. St. P. & K. C.....	1892	850
Howard, E. A., Fairfield, v. C. St. P. M. & O., fare paid on train.....	1892	861
Iowa Leather and Saddlery Co., Des Moines, v. O. & St. L., inquiry.....	1887	119
Ives, C. J., v. B. C. R. & N., reduced rates to Y. M. C. A. secretaries.....	1892	354
Leeds Improvement Co., v. Ill. Cent., five-cent fare to Leeds.....	1889	1084
Linderman, M., Epworth, v. Ill. Cent., can companies be compelled to issue commutation tickets.....	1897	80
Madison, E. P., Ottumwa, v. C. B. & Q., stop-over checks.....	1880	76
Poorman, D. A., Des Moines, v. C. B. & Q., extra fare paid on train.....	1891	835
Springer, A., Prairie City, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to redeem tickets.....	1885	189
Stevenson, E. C., Rockwell City, v. D. M. N. & W., discrimination.....	1895	333
Stewart, A. D., Yale, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for refund of excess.....	1890	229
Tracey, L. D., Des Moines, letter concerning excess paid on train.....	1879	31
Weston, A. A., Victor, v. C. R. I. & P., overcharge.....	1898	66
White, D. F., Grinnell, v. C. R. I. & P., 10 cents extra paid on train.....	1895	231
Witham, J. W., Spirit Lake, v. B. C. R. & N., excessive.....	1888	673
PASSENGERS TO SHIPPERS OF LIVE STOCK—see Omnibus Privileges.		
PATRONAGE AT RAILROADS, SOLICITATION OF—see Omnibus Privileges.		
PAYING, carriers must pave between and one foot outside of rails in streets.....	1884	77
PENALTIES, for failure to apply commissioners' rates agreement concerning.....	1889	35
PERCENTAGE OF IOWA TONNAGE—see Tonnage.		
PERCENTAGES to short lines.....	1878, 15; 1879, 65-69; 1883, 737; 1893	33
PERISHABLE PROPERTY, DELAY IN HANDLING—see Damages.		
PERKINS, C. E., president C. B. & Q., letter of, on long and short haul.....	1886	487
Letter of, adopting commissioner's rates.....	1889	29
PERSONAL INJURY.		
Frazier, James, Paulina, v. C. & N.-W., thrown out of buggy.....	1884	521
Hill, Enoch, Mitchellville, v. C. R. I. & P., mail pouch thrown from train.....	1896	130
Martin, F. A., Washington, v. C. R. I. & P.....	1882	331
Reid, Charles, Wessington, v. B. C. R. & N., damages on account of.....	1893	679
Stephens, C. W., Woodward, v. C. M. & St. P., in caboose in collision.....	1888	715
Stringham, Alonzo, Koller, v. C. B. & Q., damages for.....	1895	233
PHYSICAL CONDITION OF ROADS, IMPROVED.....		
PLATFORMS, height of at stations.....		
PLATFORMS AT RAILROAD CROSSINGS—see Joint Stations.		
POLITICAL situation in Iowa discussed.....	1888	44-45
POOLS AND POOLING.		
Discussion of.....	1878, 48; 1879, 69; 1882, 48; 1893, 43, 56; 1894	361
Discussion of, in national convention of commissioners.....	1894	361
Effect of, on trade and commerce.....	1886	55
Failure of, as a method of controlling rates.....	1888	57, 58
Forbidden by law.....	1883	648
Legality of.....	1887	89
Paper on, by Peter A. Dey.....	1894	363
Pooling contracts, sanctions for.....	1887	45
"Popular and Legal View Concerning," Judge Cooley.....	1886	34
Potter, T. J., letter on.....	1883	647
POSTING OF TARIFFS—see Tariffs.		
POULTRY, LIVE, PROVISIONS FOR SHIPMENT OF.		
Gentner, W. H., Farmington, v. C. B. & K. C.....	1898	49
POWER OF COMMISSIONERS—see Authority, also, Commissioners.		
PREPAID CHARGES—see Charges, Rates, Prepayment; also, Freight Charges.		



	YEAR	PAGE
<b>PREPAYMENT OF CHARGES.</b>		
Conesville, Carpenter, C. O., of, v. B. C. K. & N., guarantee of charges on perishable freight.....	1895	40
Doyle, Charles T., Panora, v. C. & N. W., on household goods.....	1883	638
Prepayment, no discrimination allowable. (Diamond Jo case).....	1889	1074
<b>PRESENT CASH VALUE—see Value.</b>		
<b>PRIVATE CLAIMS—see, also, Damages</b>		
Commissioners no authority to collect.....	1889	1082
<b>PRIVATE SIDE TRACKS—see Side Tracks.</b>		
PROCEDURE before railroad commissioners.....	1892	21-39
PROPORTION OF EARNINGS TO SHORT LINES—see <i>Percentage to Short Lines.</i>		
PRO-RATING discussed in re Merrill v. K. & W.....	1888	739
In Iowa, discussed.....	1884	6
For "feeding" lines.....	1879	65
PROSPERITY OF RAILS.....	1891	4
<b>PROTECTION FROM CROSSINGS—see Crossing.</b>		
<b>PUBLIC WAREHOUSES—see Warehouse, Public.</b>		
PUBLICITY of railroad matter desirable.....	1878	71
PURDY, W. G., vice-president C., R. I. & P., earnings discussed by.....	1889	8
Letter of, on cash value of railroads.....	1888	42-43
<b>QUOTATIONS OF RATES BY AGENTS BINDS CARRIERS—see Rates.</b>		
<b>RAILROAD QUESTION.</b>		
Address by Thomas M. Cooley.....	1891	29
Anderson, Commissioner, paper on, by.....	1883	52
Discussion of.....	1884	4-39
In its relation to accounts and statistics of companies.....	1893	400
Origin and problem of, Adams.....	1881	81
Spencer Smith, Commissioner, on.....	1889	21
RAILROAD SITUATION IN THE WEST. Paper by Gen. G. M. Dodge.....	1888	39
<b>RAILROADS.</b>		
Abandonment of road and taking up track—see <i>Abandonment of Road.</i>		
Are public highways.....	1881, 77;	1886 54
Classification of, "A," "B," "C".....	1881	85
Crossing railroad, failure to stop at—see <i>Crossing Stop.</i>		
Elevation of—see <i>Topographical Discussion.</i>		
History of—see, also, <i>History</i> .....	1880	239
In hands of receivers—see <i>Receivers.</i>		
In the west, situation of, General Dodge.....	1888	39
Laws—see <i>Laws Relating to Railways.</i>		
Legislation concerning—see <i>Legislation.</i>		
Ownership or control by government—see <i>Government.</i>		
Present cash value of, letters concerning, etc.....	1887, 131-147;	1888 661
Progress of railroad building discussed.....	1881	77
Stockholders and public equally interested in prosperity of.....	1886	54
Their origin and problems, Adams.....	1881	81
Their relation to the territory they were built to serve.....	1886	50, 53
When in private business cannot discriminate in favor of themselves.....	1889	1046
<b>RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS.</b>		
Additional powers of, discussed—see, also, <i>Commissioners, Authority of.</i>	1885	56
Authority of, discussion concerning law granting additional power to.....	1884	42, 81
Conference of—see <i>Commissioners.</i>		
Convention of.....	1881	164
Discussion of, by Judge Cooley.....	1883	45
List of Iowa commissioners—see <i>Commissioners.</i>		
Law discussed.....	1885	36
Made elective.....	1889	25
National convention of, at Columbus—see, also, <i>Commissioners.</i>	1878	73-74
Report to the Cullom committee on interstate commerce.....	1885	33

	YEAR	PAGE
<b>RATES, FREIGHT—for passenger rates, see <i>Passenger Fares.</i></b>		
Adoption of commissioners' rates by railroads, February, 1889.....	1889	29-30
Agreement of companies to adopt commissioners' schedule.....	1889	35
Application by Iowa trunk lines for advance in.....	1894	184
based solely on comparison with rates in other states.....	1894	193
As between through lines and local lines, percentages.....	1893	33
Authority of commissioners to make, under law of 1878.....	1889	25
Car load rates on mixed cars of linseed and carbon oils.....	1892	844
Carriers no ground for complaint at reduction of by public authority to the average it voluntarily accepts. <i>Int. Com. Com'n</i> .....	1891	10
Carriers using class A rates on interstate business cannot plead for class B locally, when such rates discriminate against Iowa. B. C. R. & N.....	1890	871
Gerro Gordo and Ida counties, citizens of, petition of, to reduce.....	1895	220
Coal, ice, etc., for less than five miles.....	1890, 908-922;	1891 739
Coal, petition for advance in for 200 miles and upwards.....	1892	791
Coal, protest of operators against advance in.....	1894	191
Coal rates, investigation of, ordered by Twenty-seventh General Assembly.....	1899	9
Coal, schedule in 1880.....	1880	28, 37
Coal, schedule suggested by Governor Larrabee in Glenwood case.....	1887	633
Commissioners', apply on shipments from point to point in Iowa, though passing outside in transit.....	1892	38, 39
Commissioners', criticised by W. G. Purdy, vice-president C., R. I. & P.....	1888	41, 42
Commissioners', effect of on purely local roads.....	1891	13, 14
Commissioners', effect on Iowa business.....	1891, 9-16;	1891 216
Commissioners', intended to afford relief to business interests of state and give reasonable compensation for service.....	1888	35
Commissioners', original schedule, higher than voluntary by carriers.....	1888	33
Commissioners', promulgated under law of 1888.....	1888, 35;	1889 933
Commissioners', proven satisfactory.....	1892	25
Commissioners', reasonable maximum a check on rate wars.....	1891	4
Commissioners' schedule, applies to shipments beginning and ending in Iowa, though passing outside in transit.....	1895	216
Commissioners' schedule, effect of as applied to C., R. I. & P. local traffic.....	1888	784
Commissioners' schedule, in Dubuque shippers' case.....	1888	793
Commissioners' schedule, effect of as applied to C., B. & Q. traffic in Iowa.....	1888	816, 817
Commissioners', what was taken into consideration in fixing.....	1888	35
Commissions paid for business, evidence of, too high. <i>Int. Com. Com'n</i> .....	1891	10
Commodity, to manufacturers in Iowa impracticable to grant.....	1894	199
Comparison the proper method of judging a tariff.....	1888, 764-784-815;	1884 191
Comparison of, in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio and Michigan, with Iowa distance tariff.....	1888, 767, 785, 801;	1894 193
Comparison of, between Chicago and Iowa points, and Davenport, Dubuque and Burlington and Iowa points for some distances.....	1888, 762, 790, 805, 812	
Comparative table of, for distances five miles to 430 miles.....	1879	10, 12
Competition in, or equality of.....	1886	33
Complaints of, usually from non-competitive points.....	1882	50
Conspiracy concerning, charge of not sustained.....	1888	796
Corn, from point to point in Iowa unreasonable.....	1886	54
Crosby, G. H., freight auditor C., R. I. & P., concerning effect of.....	1888	45
Cutting, effect of on revenue—see, also, <i>Rate Wars</i> .....	1891	4
Cut rates or rebates, burden of borne by public instead of carriers.....	1891	10
Davenport shippers' complaint.....	1888	767
Decrease of.....	1880	173
Differential.....	1882	32
Disastrous effect of lack of uniformity in.....	1882	48
Discussed in "Railroad Question"—see <i>Railroad Question.</i>		
Discussed.....	1879, 63, 65, 70;	1881 6
Discussion of, by President Perkins of C., B. & Q.....	1884	10
Discussed at national convention of commissioners.....	1891	30-35
Discrimination between stations and shippers.....	1883	61
Discrimination in against localities.....	1885	44



## RATES—FREIGHT—continued—

	YEAR	PAGE
Discrimination in just and unjust.....	1880	179
Discrimination in, evil effects of.....	1883	53
Discrimination in to Iowa jobbing centers.....	1882	53
Distances for over 400 miles.....	1889	1103
Earned, distribution of, among expenses.....	1885	54
Earnings in Iowa under commissioners'.....	1891	13
Effects of adoption of class A on roads entitled to a 50 per cent higher.....	1891	14
Elevators favored in.....	1883	62
Express, discussed.....	1897	5
Farm products discussed.....	1884	30
Fixed by board, contested in the courts, discussion of.....	1888	35
Flexibility of, desirable.....	1890	59
Fluctuation of.....	1885	43
General discussion of in reference to wholesalers and retailers.....	1884	71
Gradual reduction of, comparative tables of.....	1881	7, 16-51
Grain and other products in Iowa, rates on discussed.....	1884	7-13
High.....	1833	92
How may just rates be determined? etc.....	1893	406, 407
Increase of.....	1878	59
In Iowa on corn, oats, and stock, compared by years.....	1884	31
Iowa, railroads receive full amount of allowed by schedule.....	1894	196
Iowa rates, supreme court's opinion on, in Barris case, discussed.....	1897	9
Illinois, rates fixed by commissioners not actually charged.....	1894	195
Illinois, rates based on mileage percentage of through rates or arbitrates.....	1894	196
Interstate on corn, voluntary reduction of by Iowa lines.....	1884	12
Interstate, regulation of by state authority not authorized.....	1882	28
Interstate, discriminating against Iowa points.....	1888	790
Jobbers and retailers equal.....	1884	69
Jobbers, withdrawn by railroad companies.....	1884	70
Largest immediate returns not necessarily most profitable.....	1883	41
Law granting power to fix, § 24, literal copy of Illinois law.....	1888, 31;	1894
Law cannot be construed away by commissioners.....	1894	190
Laws of surrounding states, provisions of regarding.....	1895	171
Legislation recommended.....	1889	42
Litigation concerning.....	1889	30
Live stock in palace cars—see <i>Palace Stock Cars</i> .....		
Live stock, in less than car load, requirement of company for attendants, etc.....	1894	347
Local, conference between commissioners and railroad officials.....	1879	9
Logs in Indiana and Illinois compared with log rates in Iowa.....	1891	785
Logs should be the same as elm wood, opinion by President C. J. Ives.....	1891	786
Logs compared with rates on manufactured lumber.....	1891	786
Losses by competitive made up at non-competitive.....	1882	48
Lower, than published tariff, accepted by carrier, conclusive evidence that published rates are unreasonably high. <i>Int. Com. Com'n</i> .....	1891	10
Low rates in dull seasons, no criterion for establishment of new schedule.....	1889	1095
Manufacturers in Iowa should have low on raw material.....	1883	35-45
Maximum in Iowa higher than in Illinois.....	1882	28
Maximum and minimum, discussion of.....	1885	53
May legitimately be reduced to average of what is received for railroad service, including that done free or at reduced rates. <i>Int. Com. Com'n</i> .....	1891	11
Mileage on cars furnished by shippers, acts as rebate (Schoonmaker).....	1891	30
Misquoted by agents—see <i>Liability</i> .....		
Nebraska, Justice Brewer's opinion of rates in.....	1894	198
Nebraska, not correct basis of comparison with Iowa.....	1894	198
On branch lines, not determined by cost of service thereon.....	1883	45
Overcharge accruing during infraction against commissioners' rates.....	1894	282
Per cent of increase of in tariff of May 10, 1888, over Illinois rate.....	1888	752-753
Percentage of Iowa local to through on C. B. & Q.....	1883	817
Percentage of through rates effective in Illinois, but not in Iowa.....	1895	511
Percentage of, allowed to short lines on through business.....	1879	85
Per ton per mile compared, 1868 to 1881, for 300 miles.....	1881	8

## RATES—FREIGHT—continued—

	YEAR	PAGE
Per ton per mile from Chicago to Iowa points compared with Iowa rates.....	1889	1090
Per ton per mile.....	1884	29
Petition of Cerro Gordo and Ida counties for reduction in.....	1895	x, 230
Posting of—see <i>Tariffs</i> .....		
Population and earnings per mile in various states.....	1894	198
Power of legislature to delegate power to fix discussed.....	1888	35-36
Procedure followed.....	1892	25
Producer forgotten in fixing.....	1882	49-50
Proportion of through should not be higher than local.....	1884	515
Pro-rating per mile as a rate-making basis.....	1879	68
Pro-rate percentage.....	1894	196
Pro-rate percentage not permitted west of Mississippi river.....	1894, 197, 198;	1895
Publicity of tends to prevent abuses.....	1882	31-51
Publicity of, good results from.....	1884	4
Reasonable, discussion of.....	1886	29
Reasonableness and stability of, the first requirement.....	1882	49
Reasonable discussed, paper by Commissioner Fleming, Kentucky.....	1894	218
Reasonable, discussed by Judge Brewer.....	1894	218
Reasonable, decision of Minnesota supreme court affecting.....	1887	302
Reasonableness of, experiment the only test—Judge Brewer's decision.....	1889	32-34
Reasonable, defined by Interstate commerce commission.....	1891, 10;	1894
Reasonable, defined by Judge Brewer.....	1894	218, 219
Reasonable, defined by Iowa commissioners.....	1894	221
Reasonable, value of railroad property an element in determining.....	1894	221, 227
Reasonable discussed.....	1892	45
Reasonable, report of committee on, at national convention of.....	1893	40a
Reduced on several carloads.....	1880	182
Reduction in by railway companies.....	1890	24
Reduction of on grain.....	1884	9-12
Reduction, 80 per cent in local, by Illinois railroad commission.....	1882	26
Reduction of not always followed by reduction of gross or net revenue—Judge Brewer's decision.....	1889	34
Relation of to business depression and market price of article hauled.....	1884	6-8
Request by commission for temporary reduction of corn rates in Iowa on account of partial failure of corn crop.....	1886	619
Retail and wholesale—see <i>Carload Rates</i> .....		
Review of rate hearing in 1894.....	1895	v
Revised on request of railroads for 300 miles.....	1888	35
Ripsey, E. P., testimony of concerning effect on C. B. & Q. revenue.....	1883	817
Sand case, Barris v. C. B. Q., maximum rates.....	1897	9
Schedule of adopted in Davenport, Dubuque and Burlington rate cases.....	1888, 752, 773, 797	
Schedule of proposed by Commissioner Day in 1894 case.....	1894	233
Schedule of—see <i>Schedule of Rates</i> .....		
Should share prosperity and adversity of locality.....	1878	49
Should sympathize with circumstances and conditions of the people.....	1886	54
Should they be "what traffic will bear?".....	1881	92
Special to favored shippers.....	1885	42
Stability of desirable.....	1865	43
Statute concerning cannot be construed away by commission.....	1894	199
Success of commissioners' rates due in part to absence of rate wars.....	1891	11
Switching in Des Moines street railway case—see also, <i>Switching</i> .....	1892	790
Tariff not always evidence of actual rates charged— <i>Int. Com. Com'n</i> .....	1891	10
Tariff of 1879 a result of conference.....	1879	9-14
Temporary injunction by Judge Brewer.....	1888	36
Territorial assignment in.....	1892	51
Their alleged effect requiring reduction in number of employees.....	1891	17
Through, too low; local, too high.....	1878	49
Through and local compared.....	1881	10
Through rates as related to local.....	1882	27
Uniformity in desired.....	1878	49
United States and Austria-Hungary compared.....	1881	10



## RATES—FREIGHT—continued—

	YEAR	PAGE
Via shortest route, shipper entitled to.....	1891	773
Voluntarily charged by carriers fix the maximum that can be claimed from the public— <i>Int. Com. Com'n</i> .....	1891	10
When lowered, can be raised with difficulty.....	1886	54
When quoted by agents, carriers are bound by.....	1886	609
Which induce largest volume of business at reasonable return for services rendered, most profitable to carriers and the public.....	1883	41
Wholesale and retail.....	1880	182
Wholesale and retail features of transportation problem.....	1884	71
Wholesale and retail justified.....	1878	26
With reference to improved condition of roads, discussed.....	1891	25
COMPLAINTS CONCERNING.		
Armstrong, D. & Co., Farley, v. R'y Co., discrimination in.....	1879	15
Baker Wire Co., Des Moines, v. Various R'ys, petition for equalization of.....	1887	714
Barber, Ed., Glidden, v. C. & N.-W., excessive, on buggy.....	1894	49-69
Barrett, J. E. & Son, Mt. Vernon, v. C. & N.-W., discrimination in on flour.....	1886	482
Beeman, O. D., Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., excess on hard coal, interstate.....	1890	109
Besley, L. O., Council Bluffs, v. C. B. & Q., for restoration of sand rates.....	1893	246
Best, W. J., Villisca, v. C. B. & Q., excess, interstate.....	1899	72
Boles, Horace, governor, v. B. O. R. & N., petition for reduced on round trip shipments of stock cattle.....	1893	246
Brazil Coal Co., Chicago, v. C. M. & St. P., on coal, refusal to apply Iowa rates as proportion of through rate.....	1895	185
Buffington, B. F. & Co., Red Oak, v. C. B. & Q., excessive on wheat.....	1879	30
Burlington, shippers of, v. C. B. & Q. et al., extortionate of May 10, 1888.....	1888	197
Butler, Wm., Clarinda, v. Wabash, against grain loaded from wagons.....	1883	711
Cade, H. I., Lenox, attendant with live stock shipments, L. C. L.....	1894	347
Cerro Gordo and Ida counties, petition of citizens of, for lower freight rates.....	1895	x, 320
Chamberlain & Co., Winthrop, v. Ill. Cent., on flour.....	1887	681
Chase & Co., Red Oak, v. C. B. & Q., excessive on wheat.....	1879	81
C. St. P. & K. C., ruling on reduced rates for seed grain.....	1892	838
Coal exchange, Boone, v. C. & N.-W., discrimination on coal.....	1884	559
Coal rates, in Iowa, investigation of.....	1890	19
Coker, Henry, and board of trade, Council Bluffs, v. C. R. I. & P., extortionate on coal, and discrimination.....	1888	834
Cole, J. S. & Son, Greene, v. B. O. R. & N., proportion of through rates should not be higher than local.....	1884	524
Conaway, J. A., Chariton, v. C. B. & Q., on excess of ten head of live stock.....	1890	102
Council Bluffs board of trade, v. C. & N.-W., O. & St. L., K. C., St. J. & C. B., unreasonable and discriminative, petition for adoption of commissioners' schedule.....	1889	1051
Crystall Mill Co., Council Bluffs, v. K. C., St. J. & C. B., on flour.....	1883	715
Daugherty, J. F., Sup'r, Keokuk, v. St. L., K. & N.-W., excessive on coal.....	1895	217
Davenport, shippers of, v. various railways, extortionate of May 10, 1888.....	1888	752
Davenport shippers, petition for revision of, on B. O. R. & N., on basis of interstate rates.....	1889 1084, 1087	
Davenport, shippers of, v. B. O. R. & N., et al., petition for establishment of class A rates.....	1889 1022, 1087	
Dennis, J. B., Traer, v. B. O. R. & N., excessive on merchandise.....	1884	515
D. M., N. & W., on hay, petition of, for an advance in.....	1893	168
Dickey, Wm. G., Maxwell, v. C. M. & St. P. et al., on coal.....	1887	779
Dickey, Wm. G., Maxwell, v. C. M. & St. P., unreasonable on coal.....	1888	675
Donahue, Robert, Burlington, v. railway companies, on iron.....	1894	327
Doolittle, M. B., Cresco, v. C. M. & St. P., discrimination on hay.....	1888	711
Dorn, A. A., Neola, v. C. R. I. & P., excessive on hogs to Omaha.....	1888	670
Downs, J. O., Albia, v. C. B. & Q., discrimination in lumber rates.....	1879	84
Dubuque, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., extortionate.....	1881	144
Dubuque, shippers of, v. C. M. & St. P. et al., extortionate of May, 1888.....	1888	773
Ellyson, Zed, West Liberty, v. B. O. R. & N., on horse.....	1886	511
Express companies, law concerning rates.....	1896	4
Fassett & Hanson, Stanton, v. C. B. & Q., on cattle.....	1879	35

## RATES—FREIGHT—COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—continued—

	YEAR	PAGE
Fleming, W. & J., McGregor, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive on lumber.....	1880	7
Foster, Suel, Muscatine, v. B. O. R. & N., on small and large shipments, long and short hauls.....	1885	557
Fowler company, The, Waterloo, v. Ill. Cent., discrimination in, on apples.....	1886	484
Gasper Bros., Kingsley, v. C. & N.-W., extortionate local in Iowa.....	1888	692
Groneweg & Schoentgen, Council Bluffs, v. K. C., St. J. & C. B., excessive.....	1882	535
Groneweg & Schoentgen, Council Bluffs, v. K. C., St. J. & C. B., unreasonable.....	1883	604
Harris, H. P., Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., excessive on wood.....	1884	506
Hay rates, Rodgers et al., Britt, petition for reduction.....	1896	27
Haver, J. & Co., Tingley, v. C. B. & Q., exorbitant on corn to Chicago.....	1888	741
Heaton Fuel Co., Council Bluffs, v. C. R. I. & P., excessive on coal.....	1888	709
Hemmingway, M., Hampton, attendant with L. C. L. live stock.....	1894	347
Hershey Lumber Co., Muscatine, v. B. O. R. & N., change without notice.....	1883	565
Hewett, S. M., Hamburg, v. K. C., St. J. & C. B. et al., excessive rates.....	1882	538
Hill, John N., Ft. Dodge, v. M. & St. L., discrimination in.....	1882	557
Hogaboom, S. R., Creston, v. C. B. & Q., higher for short than for long hauls.....	1895	226
Humeston & Shenandoah R'd Co., application of "A" rates to.....	1890	103
Hummer, Geo., Mercantile Co., Iowa City, v. B. O. R. & N., excessive, interstate.....	1890	67
Huntington, W. A., Calmus, v. C. & N.-W., extortionate on coal.....	1888	695
Huse, S. E., Coon Rapids, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive, short coal haul.....	1887	722
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Dey.....	1887	723
Iowa Central, application for increase on live stock.....	1894	347
Iowa State Jobbers and Manufacturers association v. Iowa trunk lines, petition for restoration of former.....	1885	535
Iowa State Jobbers and Manufacturers association v. Iowa trunk lines, petition for reduction in Iowa rates to correspond with reduction in interstate rates.....	1894	288
Iowa trunk lines, petition of, for advance in Iowa rates.....	1894	184
Ives, C. D., general freight agent B. O. R. & N., as special committee Western Freight association, application for withdrawal of stock cattle rates.....	1891	728
Jameson, Leon, Adel, inquiry of, concerning right of large and small shippers to.....	1888	837
Judd, A. T. et al., v. Various Lines, excessive, on breeding animals.....	1894	493
Kanau, Sprengle, Imogene, v. Wabash, on corn to Chicago.....	1883	704
Keefe, James, Ft. Dodge, v. M. & St. L., unreasonable on coal.....	1889	1004
Kingsley, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W., excessive.....	1888	698
Lane Implement Co., Red Oak, v. C. B. & Q., higher charge for short than for long distances.....	1895	175
Larrabee, Gov. William, v. C. B. & Q., discrimination in, on coal.....	1887 624, 670	
Leligh, citizens of, v. Crooked Creek Railway company, unreasonable.....	1878	28
Lighthall, B., Alden, v. Ill. Cent., discrimination in.....	1882	564
Manatrey, J. P., Fairfield, v. C. B. & Q., on live stock, L. C. L., passenger fare for attendant accompanying not authorized.....	1894	276
Mason City & Ft. Dodge Railroad company, application for increase in.....	1890	906
McClintock, William, West Union, v. B. O. R. & N., excessive.....	1879	17
Merrill, J. H. & Co., Ottumwa, v. K. & N.-W., discrimination in.....	1888	739
Merrill & Keeney, Des Moines, v. C. & N.-W., et al., on furniture C. L.....	1883	678
Merrill & Keeney, case, to jobbers and retailers.....	1884	69
Minneapolis Lumber Co., Belmond, v. M. C. & Ft. D., coal.....	1892	843
Mitchell, C. W., Dubuque, v. all lines, implements returned for repairs.....	1892	833
Muffy, W. H., Osage, v. Ill. Cent., discrimination in, on wheat.....	1879	16
Nye & Bourne, Grundy Center, v. B. O. R. & N. et al., on merchandise.....	1883	733
Oskaloosa Water Co., Oskaloosa, v. Cent. Iowa, excessive, switching.....	1886	590
Ottumwa Iron Works v. C. O., R. I. & P., application for special.....	1882	482
Palm, W. J., Grundy Center, v. B. O. R. & N., interstate on coal.....	1895	231
Pierce, J. K., Lockridge, v. C. B. & Q., excessive on coal.....	1887	665
Raney Bros., Fairfield, v. Railway Companies, on paving brick.....	1897	111
Rand Lumber Co., Burlington, v. C. B. & Q., on lumber.....	1892	550
Red Oak township, trustees of, et al., v. C. B. & Q., rates, rebates, etc.....	1882	564
Reeves, Henry, Decorah, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive on hogs, interstate.....	1899	108
Richie, W. S., Muscatine, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive on potatoes.....	1880	133
Risk, C. O., Fairfield, v. C. B. & Q., on corn.....	1887	686
Robinson, C. W., Dubuque, v. B. O. R. & N., discrimination excessive.....	1882	560



## RATES-FREIGHT-COMPLAINTS CONCERNING-continued-

Rodefer, J. W., Council Bluffs, v. C. & N.-W., transfer charges.....	1879	38
Saucer, W. H., Ackley, v. Ill. Cent., on marble.....	1883	68
Shaver & Dows, Cedar Rapids, v. joint western classification, crackers.....	1883	859
Shepherd & Carpenter, Iowa City, v. C. & R. I. P. et al., non-competitive.....	1883	637
Smith, H. D., Monticello, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive.....	1882	563
Smith Bros., Waterloo, v. B. C. R. & N., on hard coal.....	1883	676
Smythe, Robert, v. C. & N.-W., protest against increase in.....	1879	8
Spencer Bros., Randolph, v. C. B. & Q., excessive.....	1882	540
Squires & Son et al., Milo, v. C. B. & Q., excessive.....	1886 511,	512
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Coffin.....	1886	512
State of Iowa, by Governor Larrabee, v. C. B. & Q., discrimination in, on coal.....	1887 624,	670
Stewart, John T., Council Bluffs, v. C. & N.-W., et al., on live stock.....	1879	26
Stocker et al., v. railway companies, discrimination in, on various commodities.....	1879	7
Stotts & Houston, Exira, v. C. R. I. & P., discrimination in on stove.....	1879	20
Summers, William & Sons, Ft. Atkinson, v. C. M. & St. P., special.....	1894	180
Sweet, A. L., Chicago, v. C. & N.-W., through rates on coal.....	1895	178
Taylor, J. C., Des Moines, v. C. B. & Q., discrimination in.....	1882	531
Townsend, J. W., Kahoka, Mo., v. C. R. I. & P., excessive on oats.....	1886	574
Van Valkenburg, A. B., Ames, excessive.....	1879	21
Webb, Henry, Kew, v. C. B. & Q., exorbitant.....	1883	626
Whitebreast Fuel Co. et al., application of, for advance in coal rates.....	1892	791
White, W. Q., Ellston, v. C. B. & Q., application of "A" rates to H. & S. Rd.....	1899	103
Whiting, T. H., Clermont, v. B. C. R. & N., excessive on tile.....	1887	753
Wood, W. A., Harvester Co., St. Paul, commissioners' rates apply on shipments beginning and ending in Iowa, though passing outside in transit.....	1895	216
York, J., Zenorville, v. C. & N.-W., on coal.....	1888	836

## RATE WARS—see, also, Rates.

Discussion of, by Charles Francis Adams.....	1883	39
Discussed in relation to earnings.....	1891	16
In 1881.....	1882	32

## REASONABLE RATES FOR SWITCHING CARS—see Switching.

## REASONABLE RATES—see Rates.

## REBATES.

Allowed to Omaha and refused to Council Bluffs.....	1886	537
Carriers should not discriminate in between shippers.....	1883	708
General practice of carriers to grant.....	1888	765
Merrill & Keeney, Des Moines, v. C. & N.-W. et al., on furniture.....	1883	678
Should they be allowed?.....	1885	28-42
Tasker, A. C. and T. G., Onslow, v. C. & N.-W., on hay.....	1886	684
Winkler, J. W., Woodward, v. C. M. & St. P., on grain and live stock.....	1883	705

## RE-BILLING—see Through Billing.

RECEIVERS. Roads in hands of.....	1890, 8; 1891	17
-----------------------------------	---------------	----

## RECEIVING AND FORWARDING CARS—see Refusal to Receive and Forward Cars.

## "RECIPROCITY."

Hoffman, A. G., Plato, v. B. C. R. & N., in demurrage charges.....	1893	233
--	------	-----

## REDUCED PASSENGER FARE—see Passenger Fare.

## REDUCED RATES, ON CORN, CATTLE, CARLOADS OF COMMODITIES, ETC.—see Rates.

## ON ROUND SHIPMENTS OF STOCK CATTLE—see Rates.

## REFRIGERATOR CARS.

Fowler, C. W., Rowan, v. B. C. R. & N., failure to use, veal damaged.....	1895	166
Hise Bros., Washington, v. C. R. I. & P., for dairy products.....	1886	568
Hughey & Son, Wirt, v. H. & S., refusal to furnish.....	1884	564
Marshall & Son, Chariton, v. C. B. & Q., failure to furnish.....	1884	597
Shaver Cheese Co., Cedar Rapids, v. B. C. R. & N., rights of shippers.....	1894	305

## REFUNDING OF OVERCHARGE—see Overcharge.

Shanks & Coats, West Mitchell, v. C. B. & Q.....	1883	554
Swezey & Borman, Newell, v. Illinois Central.....	1883	539

## REFUSAL TO CARRY PASSENGERS ON FREIGHT TRAINS—see Train Service.

## REFUSAL TO FURNISH REFRIGERATOR CARS—see Refrigerator Cars; also Failure to Furnish Cars.

## REFUSAL TO FURNISH CARS—see Failure to Furnish Cars.

## REFUSAL TO SWITCH—see Switching.

## REFUSAL OF USE OF PRIVATE SWITCH FOR LOADING CARS—see Side Track.

## REFUSAL TO ALLOW LOADING OF CARS FROM WAGONS—see Rights of Shippers.

REFUSAL TO RECEIVE AND FORWARD FREIGHT AND CARS.....	1878	16
When destined to certain markets.....	1890	932
Beed, William G., Hampton, v. Illinois Central, to send cars off its own line.....	1888	671
Bernard Bros., Malcom, v. C. R. I. & P.....	1885	189
Boyd, H. E., Malcom, v. C. R. I. & P., failure to forward coal.....	1898	91
Carleton, E. O., Grand Junction, v. C. R. I. & P., hog shipment.....	1892	846
Converse, S. A., Cresco, v. C. M. & St. P., to haul Burton stock cars.....	1888	700
Crawford, R. W., Fort Dodge, v. D. M. & Ft. D., to carry alcohol.....	1884	582
Dodge, Daniel, What Cheer, v. C. R. I. & P., coal in carloads.....	1887	729
Dorr Cattle Co., Des Moines, v. D. M. N. & W., refusal to provide cars for slop feed.....	1898	84
Great Western Fuel Co., Gilmore, v. C. & N.-W.....	1885	570
Greene, J. A., et al., Stone City, v. C. M. & St. P., refusal to forward cars of stone unless shippers pay the expense of staking and planing the end.....	1892	820
Hambleton Milling Co., Keokuk, v. C. R. I. & P., grain shipments.....	1895	234
Hammond, H. E., Carroll, v. C. R. I. & P., for points on other lines.....	1883	674
Hastings, mayor and council of, v. C. B. & Q., coal shipments.....	1880	39
Hoag, J. M., Maquoketa, v. C. M. & St. P., ponies for state fair.....	1889	1063
Iowa Fuel Co., Des Moines, v. C. St. P. & K. C., coal shipments.....	1888	718
Iowa Central Railway v. C. R. I. & P., flour.....	1895	187
Irwin, Phillips & Co., Keokuk, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to make joint rates.....	1887	717
Jennings Bros., Malcom, v. C. R. I. & P.....	1893	189
Jerome, F. H., v. C. B. & Q.....	1882	445
Keokuk & D. M. Ry. Co. v. D. M. & Ft. D. Ry. Co.....	1878	5
Levertton, John, Abbott, v. Ia. Cent. Ry., refusal to allow cars to leave line.....	1898	86
Lilburn, Samuel & Co., Ottumwa, v. C. R. I. & P.....	1880	77
McCaull-Webster Grain Co., Minneapolis, v. Ill. Cent. Ry. Co., car of grain destined east.....	1898	23
Mitchell, M. W., Warren, v. B. & S. W.....	1880	119
Muscatine melon shippers, v. C. R. I. & P., melons.....	1895	213
Norris & Co., Prairie City, v. C. R. I. & P., to send cars off its own lines.....	1896	143
Perry, N. H., Le Mars, v. D. M. & Ft. Dodge.....	1881	143
Phillips Fuel Co., Ottumwa, v. C. B. & Q. et al.....	1892	836
Ranks & Sterzbach, Rodman, v. B. C. R. & N. et al.....	1892	848
Richards & Black, Wapello, v. B. C. R. & N.....	1881	134
Risk, Alex., Winthrop, v. Ill. Cent.....	1880	115
Smith, E. F., Wellman, v. B. C. R. & N.....	1892, 849;	1899 112
Standard Lumber Co., Dubuque, v. B. & M.....	1884	586
Townsend, Le Mars, v. Ill. Cent.....	1883	615
Van Houten, E., Pella, v. C. R. I. & P.....	1881	128
Vincent, J. F., Union stock yards, Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to deliver cars.....	1896	105
Ward, C. H. & Co., Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., to handle Wabash cars.....	1884	554
Whitlock & Fields, Ladora, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to allow cars to go off its lines.....	1898	82
Willard, Son & Co., Marshalltown, v. C. G. W., to forward hides.....	1895	44
Wis., Iowa & Neb., v. Iowa Northern, to switch.....	1886	559
REGULATIONS OF CARRIERS, methods proposed.....	1886	34
REGULATIONS OF RAILROADS TO SURROUNDING TERRITORY.....	1886	50-53
RELEASED SHIPMENTS, right of shippers in—see Owner's Risk.		
RELOCATION OF HIGHWAYS, expenses of crossing borne by railway company.....	1889	1065
REMOVAL OF STATION OR FREIGHT HOUSE—see Station.		
REMOVAL OF ELEVATOR, COAL SHEDS, ETC.—see Site.		
RENTAL FOR PALACE STOCK CARS—see Palace Stock Cars.		
REPORT OF HEPBURN COMMITTEE—see Hepburn Committee.		



## REPORTS OF CARRIERS.

Difficulty of obtaining information from.....	1893, 3, 33; 1895, IV; 1897	4
Governor's questions for railway companies discussed.....	1889	42
Incomplete and inaccurate. 1878, 34; 1879, 40, 42; 1880, 156; 1890, 9; 1892, 21; 1893, 35; 1894, 223-227, 230	1891	3
On Iowa business, discussed.....	1893	3
Of carriers to commissioners, difficulty in obtaining.....	1893	3
Suggestions in reference to amendment of law concerning.....	1879	4

RESPONSIBILITY OF CARRIERS—see *Liability*; also *Damages*.RETURNS OF RAILWAY COMPANIES—see *Reports of Carriers*.

Rights of builders of side track to connect with main line.....	1889	981
Rights of carriers to control station ground, subject to rights of the public.....	1891	736
Right of company to retain its cars on its own line—see <i>Refusal to Receive and Forward Freight</i> ; <i>Failure to Furnish Cars</i> .	1886	554

Rights of the public at crossing blocked by trains.....	1889	1043
Rights of the public contributing in aid of railroad protected by the courts when road is in hands of a receiver.....	1889	1043

## RIGHTS OF SHIPPERS.

Chapin, Merritt & Co., Des Moines, v. C. M. & St. P., to select routes.....	1884	518
Clow, W. D., Traer, v. B. C. R. & N., to select route.....	1885	581
Dalhoff & Co., Burlington, v. C. B. & Q. and Wabash to select route.....	1882	561
Downey, D. B., Allison, v. C. G. W., right to choice of market.....	1890	123
Entitled to same rates as shippers from elevators when cars are loaded from wagons in same time.....	1884	526
Hambleton Milling Co., Keokuk, v. C. R. I. & P., choice of market.....	1895	231
Jerome, F. H., v. C. B. & Q., to choose market.....	1882	445
Levertown, John, Abbott, v. Iowa Cent., loading cars from wagon.....	1890	92
Muscantine melon shippers v. C. R. I. & P., choice of market.....	1895	213
Nye & Bonrue, Grundy Center, v. B. C. R. & N., to select routes.....	1883	733
Smith, J. M., v. C. B. & Q., pooling—large and small cars—pass to live stock shippers.....	1883	648
Stacy & Co., Osage, v. Ill. Cent., right to load from wagons.....	1890	121
Weston, Wm., Anita, v. C. R. I. & P., right to load from wagons.....	1890	118
White, Geo. C., Nevada, v. C. & N.-W., right to load from wagons.....	1890	121
To select route for shipments.....	1883	491
To rates by shortest route.....	1887, 751; 1891	773
To choice of market.....	1890, 932; 1892 759, 858	
Townsend, Le Mars, v. Ill. Cent., to select markets and routes.....	1883	615

RIGHT OF WAY DAMAGES—see *Damages*.

RIPLEY, E. P., G. F. A. C., B. & Q., letter of, on reduction of corn rates in Iowa.....	1886	619
---	------	-----

ROAD, ABANDONMENT OF—see *Abandonment of Road*.ROAD BUILT FROM EARNINGS IN EXCESS OF 6 PER CENT. ON \$30,000 PER MILE—see *Mileage*.ROAD WORK BY CONTRACT—see *Contract*.ROUND-TRIP RATES—see *Rates*.ROUND-TRIP SHIPMENTS OF STOCK CATTLE—see *Rates*.ROUND-TRIP TICKETS—see *Excursion Tickets*; also, *Tickets*.ROUTES, RIGHTS OF SHIPPERS TO SELECT—see *Rights of Shippers*.

RULE FOR EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF CARS—see <i>Distribution of Cars</i> .....	1888	719
---	------	-----

RUNNING RAILROAD CROSSINGS—see *Crossing Stops*.SAFETY APPLIANCES—see *Couplers and Brakes, Automatic*.

SAGE, W. M., G. F. A. C., R. I. & P., letter of, on reduction of corn rates.....	1886	621
--	------	-----

St. L., K. & N. W., information concerning ownership of.....	1893	824
--	------	-----

SALARIES OF OFFICERS.....	1888	645-650
---------------------------	------	---------

SAMPLE CASES—see *Baggage*.SAND RATES—see *Rates*.

## SANITARY AND UNSANITARY CONDITIONS.

Coolfax, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., improved in outbuildings.....	1889	1097
Everett, H., Council Bluffs, v. C. R. I. & P., of outbuildings.....	1881	135
Marengo, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P.....	1894	274

SCALES, TRACK—see *Track Scales*.SCARCITY OF CARS—see *Failure to Furnish Cars*.

SCARCITY OF COAL.....	1880	571
-----------------------	------	-----

SCHEDULE OF RATES—see also, *Rates*.

Adopted in Davenport, Dubuque and Burlington cases.....	1888, 752, 773-797	
Commissioners' was in force pending injunction suits.....	1889	1062
Distance above 400 miles.....	1889	1108
Must be posted for public inspection.....	1889	1101
Reasonable maximum rates, adoption of, by C. & N.-W.....	1889	1051
SECURITY in railroad matters to be avoided.....	1878	71

## SECRETARY OF BOARD.

Cameron, J. S.....	1878	3
Morgan, E. G.....	1880	3
Ainsworth, W. W.....	1887	3
Lewis, Dwight N.....	1899	15

## SENATE COMMITTEE, United States, investigation of, on interstate commerce..... 1885 32

SENDING CARS OFF THEIR OWN LINES—see *Refusal to Receive and Forward Freight*.

## SHIPMENTS FROM POINT TO POINT IN IOWA.

Though passing outside in transit, state commerce.....	1892	38, 39
--	------	--------

## SHIPPERS AND CARRIERS.

Shippers at stations must be afforded like facilities for doing business.....	1888	829
Their relation to each other discussed.....	1884	7

SHIPPERS ENTITLED TO RATES VIA SHORTEST ROUTES—see *Rights of Shippers*.SHIPPING FACILITIES, MONOPOLY OF AGAINST PUBLIC POLICY—see *Monopoly*.SHIPPING FACILITIES—see *Station Facilities*, *Failure to Furnish Cars*, *Refrigerator Cars*.

## SHIPPING REGULATIONS.

Budd, J. L., Ames, v. C. & N.-W.....	1882	494
Crawford, W. H., Hampton, v. Central Iowa, release on flax seed.....	1881	138
Cressler, C. W., & Co., Scranton, v. C. & N.-W., in shipment of butter.....	1810	877
Loading and unloading L. C. shipments.....	1892	888
Shippers required to protect cars for stone shipments at private expense.....	1892	860
Stockler, J. W., et al., Logan, v. C. & N.-W., in live stock.....	1880	68

SHORTAGE IN TRANSIT—see *Lost in Transit*.SHORTAGE OF CARS—see *Failure to Furnish Cars*.SHORTEST ROUTE, SHIPPERS ENTITLED TO RATES BASED ON—see *Rights of Shippers*.

## SHORT LINES—

Percentage of through rates allowed to.....	1893	33
---	------	----

SHORT LINE RATES—see *Percentage to Short Lines*.

"SHRINKER"—used on scales to defraud sellers of produce.....	1890	72
--	------	----

SIDE TRACKS—see also, *Spur Track*.

Authority of commissioners to order construction of, questioned.....	1890	857
Changing grade of, damages for.....	1890	928
Should private builders be allowed to connect with railroads?.....	1895	xxxv

## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—

Alta, citizens of, v. Illinois Central, insufficient to mill.....	1885	577
Davidson, M., Plano, v. Wabash, violation of contract in matter of building.....	1883	549
Dawson, S. R., Perry, v. W. St. L. & P., to coal and wood house.....	1887	684
Dennis, citizens of, v. A. & C., restoration of.....	1895	120
Dorcas, John, Shiloh, v. C. & N.-W., failure to furnish as per contract.....	1886	573
Fraser, J., Holmes, v. B. C. R. & N., trespassing on land designed for.....	1888	683
Hill Bros., Clarion, v. M. C. & Ft. D., refusal of use of private.....	1887	755
Marcus Roller Mills, Marcus, v. Illinois Central, petition for, to warehouse.....	1894	209
Nemmers, N. B., Lamotte, v. C. M. & St. P., to elevator.....	1892	71
Norman, citizens of, v. M. & St. L., building of, diverted business.....	1887	685
Pasco Bros., What Cheer, v. C. & N.-W., enforcing contract to construct.....	1889	980
Plover, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., petition for additional.....	1890	935
Rights of builders to connect with other railroads.....	1889, 981; 1891	45
Roberts, O. L., Grinnell, v. C. R. I. & P., discriminative privileges on.....	1889	1027
Showman, William, et al., v. C. M. & St. P., petition to restore.....	1890	917
Sindt, W. V., Holstein, v. C. & N.-W., to warehouse.....	1894	276
Smith, W. C., et al., Lockridge, v. C. B. & Q., at Coalport.....	1898	27
SIDINGS, PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, Dubuque switching case.....	1889	1084



SIGNALS, ELECTRIC, AT CROSSINGS—see *Electric Signals*.

SIOUX CITY &amp; DAKOTA R. R., history of..... 1879 111

SITES FOR COAL HOUSES, ELEVATORS, WAREHOUSES, ETC.

Carriers must not discriminate in granting..... 1890 857

Decision of the supreme court reviewed in *Sunny Hill Alliance case*..... 1892 29-31

Decision of..... 1897 4

Exclusive rights to single shippers against public policy..... 1895 xxx, xxxiv

Jurisdiction of board..... 1899 107

COMPLAINTS CONCERNING, PETITION FOR—

Adams, J. H., Havelock, v. C. &amp; N.-W., for elevator, jurisdiction of board..... 1899 107

Ashton, E. J., Edmunds, v. C., St. P., M. &amp; O..... 1899 74

Blow, M., Estherville, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., for coal shed..... 1898 60

Boutiller, H. N., Britt, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., removal of coal sheds, etc..... 1892 801

Campbell, Joel, Ayrshire, v. C. R. I. &amp; P., for coal house..... 1893 212

Carlson, S. G., Stratford, v. C. &amp; N.-W., rental for scales..... 1893 144

Carpenter, W. B., Marion, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., removal of elevator..... 1895 207

Cook, R. W., Crawfordsville, v. B. &amp; N.-W., for coal house..... 1899 98

Douglas, J. B., West Branch, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., removal of coal shed..... 1890 925

Eckert &amp; Williams, Northwood, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., at Kensett..... 1892, 862; 1899 74

Edmonds, E. J., Marcus, v. C., St. P., M. &amp; O., for elevator..... 1890 911

Farmers' Alliance, of Hartley, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., for coal house..... 1899 80

Farmers' Co-operative Ass'n, Sowa City, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., application for..... 1899 87

Farmers' Mutual Live Stock Ass'n, Kensett, inquiry..... 1892 29-31

Supreme court opinion reviewed..... 1890 940

Frazier &amp; Ballou, Primghar, v. D. &amp; S. C. (Ill. Cent.), for warehouse..... 1893 240

French &amp; King, Maxwell, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., information concerning rights of lessees of elevators on station grounds or right of way..... 1897 52

Frum, S. B., Shelby, v. C. R. I. &amp; P., for coal house..... 1897 67

Fry, U. S., Van Horne, inquiry relative to..... 1887 687

Gafford, Joseph, Burlington, v. citizens of Murray, obstructing street..... 1892 843

Gier &amp; Belz, Conrad Grove, v. C. &amp; N.-W., expense of relocation..... 1890 898

Hardin county, citizens of, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., for elevator..... 1890 887

Hodges, N. W., Storm Lake, v. Ill. Cent., discrimination and refusal of..... 1890 823

Hollis, Thomas, Radcliffe, v. C. &amp; N.-W., application for additional..... 1888 828

Jansen, Antem, Haverhill, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., for elevator..... 1891 731

Jensen, J. G. L., Gilman, v. Iowa Central, elevator..... 1894 258

Kenyon &amp; Hilliard, Mt. Union, v. B. &amp; N.-W., for elevator..... 1895 172

Kline Bros., Rockwell, v. Iowa Central, for warehouse..... 1892 823

Lancaster, W., Bradgate, v. C. &amp; N.-W., for elevator..... 1895 211

Lewis, R. G., Des Moines, v. C. R. I. &amp; P., removal of elevator..... 1885 574

McCallsburg, citizens of, v. Cent. Iowa, refusal to grant..... 1893 199

McCord &amp; Co., et al., Storm Lake, v. Ill. Cent., for coal house..... 1894 294

McNamara, J. F., Vincent, v. M. C. &amp; Ft. D., for coal house..... 1891 813

Parsons &amp; Heath, Galt, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., for grain warehouse..... 1891 824

Pickering-Johnson Grain Co., Shenandoah, v. O. &amp; St. L., at Summit..... 1893, 621; 1895 xxxiv

Pioneer Hay Camp, shipping privileges at..... 1899 29

Porter, James, Sutherland, v. Ill. Cent., removal at Larrabee..... 1892 828

Price &amp; Palmer, et al., Ellsworth, v. C. &amp; N.-W., elevator..... 1899 29

Rasmussen, A. D., et al., v. B. C. R. &amp; N., at Pioneer Hay Camp..... 1896 159

Richardson &amp; Kauffman, Belmond, v. M. C. &amp; Ft. D., removal of elevator..... 1892 859

Robinson, J. C., et al., Marathon, v. C. &amp; N.-W., coal house..... 1892 781

Ross &amp; Brady, Akron, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., grain warehouse..... 1893 154

Russell, J. M., Storm Lake, v. Ill. Cent., removal of elevator at crossing..... 1895 238

Smith, E. R., Cherokee, v. Ill. Cent., for coal house..... 1895 227

Smith, C. J., Ogden, v. C. &amp; St. L., for warehouse..... 1891 794

Smith, J. S., Jewell, v. C. M. &amp; N.-W., for elevator..... 1899 117

Smith, M. L., Elwell, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., for elevator..... 1890 856

Steer, William M., West Branch, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., for warehouse..... 1890 911

Sunny Hill Alliance, Hartley, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., for coal house..... 1898 57

Thomas, G. F., Sowa City, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., elevator at Armstrong..... 1898 26

Townsend &amp; Merrill, Cedar Falls, v. Ill. Cent., termination of lease..... 1890 895

Webster Bros., Waucoma, v. C. St. P. &amp; K. C., at Boyd..... 1890 895

SITES FOR COAL HOUSES, ETC.—continued—

Webster Bros., Waucoma, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., at Jackson Junction..... 1894 271

Wells, W. W., Webster City, v. W. C. &amp; S. W., failure to furnish..... 1889 1045

Wellsburg, citizens of, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., for elevator..... 1891 820

Wertz, C. C., Greene, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., for coal house..... 1897 21

Wilbur, D. W., Hawkeye, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., grain warehouse..... 1895 155

Williams Bros., Primghar, v. Ill. Cent., for elevator..... 1896 134

Winnebago Farmers Alliance, v. M. &amp; St. L., coal house..... 1891 732

York, Joseph, Zenosville, v. C. &amp; N.-W., for coal sheds..... 1888 836

SLEEPING CARS.

Dowell, A. B., Vinton, v. C. &amp; N.-W., holders of second-class ticket not entitled to..... 1883 652

Privileges, discrimination in, at Council Bluffs..... 1888 702

SMALL AND LARGE SHIPPERS—see *Car Load Rates*.

SMITH, SPENCER, COMMISSIONER, paper on the "Railroad Question"..... 1890 21

SNOW FENCE, APPROPRIATING LAND FOR—see *Appropriation of Land*.

SNOW BLOCKADE.

Belmond, citizens of, v. Central Iowa, failure to keep road open..... 1884 517

Cass, S. F., Sumner, v. Dub. &amp; Dak., failure to run trains on account of..... 1886 505

Goshen, citizens of, v. H. &amp; S., petition to raise..... 1886 507

Jackson, E. P. et al., Gilmore, v. D. M. &amp; Ft. D., asking removal of..... 1883 573

Tripoli, citizens of, v. C. G. W., failure to remove, and delay of trains..... 1893 225

SOFT COAL RATES—see *Rates*.SOLICITATION OF HOTEL PATRONAGE AT STATIONS—see *Omnibus Privileges*.

SPECIAL TRAIN to carry live stock, extra charge for..... 1887 782

SPECIAL RATES on building material for churches, permissible..... 1888 837

SPECIAL RATES, large shipper not entitled to, as against small shipper..... 1888 837

SPECIAL EMERGENCY RATES ON CORN—see *Rates*.SPECIAL RATES TO LARGE SHIPPERS—see *Car Load Rates*; also *Rates*.

SPEED OF FREIGHT TRAINS..... 1878 65

SPEED OF TRAINS IN CITIES.

Hill, E., Mitchellville, v. C. R. I. &amp; P., through town..... 1896 120

Malvern, city of, v. C. B. &amp; Q., danger from fast trains..... 1889 1040

SPUR TRACKS—see, also, *Side Tracks*.

Dooley, George, Newton, v. Iowa Central, protest against removal of..... 1891 737

Excelsior Coal Co., v. Central Iowa, compulsory operation of..... 1878 24

Robertson, S. A., Des Moines, taxation of quarry track..... 1881 133

Connection of with main line—see *Side Track*.

STANWOOD &amp; TIPTON RAILWAY, history of..... 1879 112

STATE AND INTERSTATE COMMERCE—see, also, *Interstate Commerce and Rates*..... 1896 4

Diamond Jo Line, v. C. B. &amp; Q..... 1889 1074, 1077

Opinion of supreme court..... 1892 901

WHAT CONSTITUTES—

Carpenter, D. J., Beloit, v. C. M. &amp; St. P., shipments from point to point within the state, though passing outside in transit, are state commerce..... 1890 849

Freight shipped from point to point within the state of Iowa, though passing outside in transit, held to be state commerce..... 1890, 1074-1077; 1890 849

Hamilton &amp; Co., Algona, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., what constitutes..... 1897 118

Heath, H. R. &amp; Sons, Ft. Dodge, v. Ill. Cent., shipments from points in the state to points outside, though rebilled in transit, interstate commerce..... 1891 164

McGillora, L. E., Larchwood, v. B. C. R. &amp; N., traffic from point to point in Iowa though passing outside in transit, is state commerce..... 1892 862

Skeen &amp; Zook, Albia, v. C. B. &amp; Q., from point to point in Iowa is state commerce..... 1880 74

STATE CONTROL OF C. R. I. &amp; P., R'y..... 1880 117

STATION—FACILITIES AND SERVICE—see, also, *Joint Stations*.Abandonment of—see *Abandonment of Station*.

Changing name of, legislation recommended..... 1889, 90; 1891 44

Cleanliness and removal of disorderly persons recommended..... 1884 42

Control of grounds, omnibus privileges—see *Omnibus Privileges*.

Exclusive use of must not be granted to one person..... 1870 809-894

Establishing of new, legislation recommended..... 1889 31

Facilities for doing business at..... 1895 xxix

Finances of company cannot be considered by board in ordering..... 1884 569



STATION-FACILITIES, ETC.—continued—	YEAR	PAGE
Grade of highway crossing over station grounds.....	1893	15, 156
Joint and Y connections—see <i>Joint Stations</i> ; also, <i>Wyes</i> .....		
New legislation recommended.....	1891	43
Profits to carriers not sole element in establishment of.....	1884	496
COMPLAINTS CONCERNING.		
Albrecht, A. S. et al., Mederville, v. C. M. & St. P., petition to rebuild station.....	1895	101
Adams, citizen of, v. D. M. N. & W., petition for depot.....	1896, 173;	1898
Algona, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., for relocation of.....	1889	1057
Applington, citizens of, to keep open at night.....	1882	455
Ashaw, v. C. B. I. & P., petition for removal of.....	1891	789
Austin, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for removal of.....	1892	863
Avery, citizens of v. C. B. & Q., petition for.....	1892	742
Barnum, C. F., Bryant, Recorder, v. Ill. Cent., dangerous location of depot.....	1895	219
Bassett, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., for flag station.....	1896	121
Bayless, F. D., Elkader, v. C. M. & St. P., facilities at Osborne.....	1892	830
Bigelow, M. F., Alden, v. Ill. Cent., insufficient night service.....	1884	505
Bingham, L. R. & Son, Estherville, v. B. C. R. & N., facilities for storing and handling perishable freight.....	1896	104
Bismarck station case.....	1889, 35, 992;	1895
Bouton, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., depot, etc.....	1890	943
Boyd, G. J., Herndon, v. C. M. & St. P., night service.....	1885	575
Boyd, citizens of, v. C. G. W. R'y, petition for depot.....	1889	84
Browns, Hale & Riggs, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., reopening.....	1891	746
Bryan, D. B., Bonton, v. C. M. & St. P., depot.....	1888	688
Bunch, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., depot at Bunch postoffice and Paris siding.....	1891	703
Butt, M. et al., Harvey, v. Wabash, platform.....	1893	210
California Junction, citizens of, v. F. E. & M. V. et al., depot.....	1887	623
Callaway, P., Atlantic, v. C. R. I. & P., privileges of stockyards.....	1895	233
Campbell, F. R., Bismarck, v. C. M. & St. P., restoration of.....	1889, 35, 992;	1895
Capron, G. F., Capron station, v. C. M. & St. P., facilities as per contract.....	1889	1058
Claypool, W. W. et al., Spencer, v. C. M. & St. P., at Hay siding.....	1893	204
Cleghorn and Cherokee county, citizens of, v. Dub. & S. C., depot.....	1889	1019
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Campbell.....	1889	1020
Cleveland, E. S., Holmes, v. B. C. R. & N., better accommodations.....	1888	706
Cleveland, E. S., Holmes, v. B. C. R. & N., facilities.....	1890	883
Coalport, restoration of sidetrack.....	1898	27
Cochran, William et al., Elmira, v. B. C. R. & N., facilities.....	1892	736
Supplemental decision.....	1892	787
Colfax, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., improved sanitary conditions.....	1889	1087
Cone, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N., flag station.....	1887	178
Corning, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., relocation of depot.....	1887	760
Council Bluffs, citizens of, v. U. P., insufficient facilities.....	1886, 530-570	
Council Bluffs, city of, v. All Entering Railways, additional facilities.....	1892	809
Crighton, C. E., Oakville, v. Iowa Central depot.....	1894	244
Crippen Creamery Co., Crippen, v. C. M. & St. P., platform.....	1894	270
Crozier, M. W., Stark, v. B. & N. W., petition for.....	1890	857
Cylinder, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., depot.....	1891	815
Dallas Center, Benton Bros., of, v. C. R. I. & P., keeping depot open.....	1898	83
David, Scholtes & Poorte, of, v. W. & W., service.....	1898	55
Davidson Bros., Hull, v. C. M. & St. P., changing name of.....	1887	692
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Coffin.....	1887	693
Dawson, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1890	937
Dawson, S. R., Percy, v. W. St. L. & P., for wood and coal.....	1887	684
Dennis, citizens of, v. A. & C., restoration of switch.....	1893	120
Des Moines, unsafe condition of union depot.....	1898	11
Diagonal, citizens of, v. C. G. W., freight station.....	1894	156
Doon, citizens of, v. C. St. P. M. & O., petition for depot at Lunt's siding.....	1896	38
Ehrick, citizens of, v. Iowa Central, for re-establishment of.....	1897	72
Evanson, depot at, W. D. Drake, et al., v. M. C. & Ft. D.....	1898	36
Everly, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1887	743
Felton, J. B., New Virginia, v. D. M. & K. O., bad condition of.....	1892	789

STATION-FACILITIES, ETC.—continued—	Year	Page
Fifield, citizens of, v. Wabash, petition for.....	1894	287
Gallagher, J. S. et al., Wesley, v. C. M. & St. P., for night operator.....	1893	262
Gaston, E. E., Van Wert, v. Wabash Western, condition of, conduct in.....	1888	626
Glendale, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., petition for.....	1890	861
Grey, L. E., Perry, v. C. M. & St. P., night service at Herndon.....	1887	923
Halley, J. R., Nashville, v. C. & N. W., station service.....	1896	94
Ham & Carver, Dubuque, v. B. C. R. & N., better mail service.....	1883	721
Hanna, J. Q., Goldfield, v. C. & N. W., location of.....	1882	432
Harrington, D. E., Postville, v. C. M. & St. P., insufficient service.....	1890	860
Hawarden, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., for building.....	1883	606
Herndon, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P. and W. St. L. & P., approaches to.....	1886	552
Hickory Grove township, Jasper county, citizens of, v. Iowa Central, facilities.....	1890	900
Hill's Siding, petition for depot at, on B. C. R. & N.....	1898	67
Rehearing declined.....	1890	901
Hodges, C. H. et al., Sexton, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1892	800
Hornaday, J. C., Wall, J. J. et al., v. C. R. I. & P. at Udell.....	1892	864
Hutchins, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1893	147
Independence, citizens of, v. Illinois Central, to stop at platforms.....	1892	785
Ira, station service.....	1895	156
Jenks, A. M., Sheldahl, v. C. & N. W., et al., platform.....	1887	699
Johnson, T. S. et al., Bonair, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1892	790
Kenwood Park, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1893	244
Klemme, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N., petition for.....	1890	884
Kniffin, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., petition for facilities.....	1891, 751;	1895
Krysher, Levi, Avon, v. C. B. & Q. and C. R. I. & P., for removal.....	1896	503
Latty, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N., for additional room at.....	1886	522
Ledyard, depot at, citizens v. B. C. R. & N. and C. & N. W.....	1898	38
Le Grand, citizens of, v. C. & N. W., relocation of.....	1894	313
Le Mars, citizens of, v. Illinois Central et al., for more commodious.....	1890	889
Lemon, H. F. et al., Elm Springs, v. C. M. & St. P., agent.....	1897	127
Lennon, H. et al., Elm Springs, v. C. M. & St. P., facilities for freight.....	1898	72
Leyner, John et al., Dallas county, v. C. R. I. & P., removal of Ashawa.....	1892	807
Lida, citizens of, v. C. St. P. & K. C., petition for.....	1889	1010
Lieser et al., Abbott, v. B. C. R. & N. and Central Iowa, joint.....	1882	440
Little Wall Lake, citizens of, v. M. C. & Ft. D., petition for flag.....	1891	830
Luana, depot platform at, P. Bredow, Maxwell, v. C. M. & St. P.....	1898	35
Lunt's Siding, petition for depot by citizens of Doon.....	1896	38
Lux, Peter et al., Hopkinton, v. C. M. & St. P., at Lux Siding.....	1893	141
Malone, J. D. et al., Santiago, v. C. St. P. & K. O., petition for.....	1899	214
Marengo, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., sanitary condition of.....	1894	274
McCusker, Edward, Loretto, v. C. St. P. & K. C., abandonment of Lida.....	1889	1010
McFarlane, William et al., Blencoe, v. S. C. & P., petition for.....	1884	508
McKinney, Mrs. J. C., Decorah, v. Ill. Cent., care of.....	1883	567
McLaughlin, D. E., David, v. W. & S. W., petition for.....	1893	257
Meibourne, citizens of, v. C. & St. P. & K. O., petition for.....	1888	735
Meibourne, J. H., Bagley, et al., v. C. G. W., joint station at crossing.....	1890	15
Meriden, citizens of, v. Ill. Cent., for rebuilding of burned.....	1886	514
Miller, J. D. et al., Ida Grove, v. C. & N. W., petition for.....	1884, 405;	1885
Miller, J. T., Iowa Falls, v. B. C. R. & N.....	1881	149
Morning Sun, citizens of, v. Central Iowa and B. C. R. & N., for.....	1884, 588;	1885
New Hartford, citizens of, v. D. & S. C., for reopening, night.....	1891	741
Norells, A., Kiron, v. C. & N. W., location of station.....	1890	100
Norway, J. T. Springer of, v. C. & N. W., lighting of depot and platform.....	1898	90
Oakley, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., petition to reopen.....	1886	501
Oakville, citizens of, v. Iowa Central, petition for additional.....	1891, 797;	1894
O'Brien Bros., Valeria, v. C. St. P. & K. C., freight house.....	1892	838
Oline Bros., Page Center, v. C. B. & Q., agent.....	1899	49
Orillia, citizens of, v. C. G. W., reopening.....	1894	228
Orillia, J. A. Garret of, v. C. G. W., day agent.....	1899	69
Osborne, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1891	740



STATION—FACILITIES, ETC.—continued—	Year	Page
Otho, citizens of, v. M. & St. L., petition for.....	1892	730
Petition for reopening.....	1895	170
Otranto, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., for larger building.....	1892	731
Page Center, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., for agent.....	1892, 730	1899
Paulger, J. et al., New Hartford, v. Ill. Cent., for night service.....	1885	553
Pleaver, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., petition for.....	1890	235
Plumer, Wm. H., Logan, v. Ill. Cent., location of.....	1899	112
Poorman, D. A., Des Moines, v. C. B. & Q., lack of.....	1891	635
Prichard, N., Warren, v. C. M. & St. P.....	1885	568
Rands, citizens of, v. D. M., N. & W., petition for.....	1893	221
Red Oak, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., relocation of freight house.....	1889	991
Reed, J. G. et al., Lime Springs, v. C. M. & St. P., night service.....	1893	213
Reynolds, J. J. et al., Blencoe, v. S. C. & P., petition for stock yards.....	1888	711
Richardson, G. W., Clear Lake, v. C. M. & St. P., at Ventura.....	1890	924
Richardson & Herard, Fairfax, v. C. & N.-W., unsuitable condition of depot.....	1889	1079
Ridgeway, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., rebuilding of burned.....	1888	751
Riggs, W. K., Castalia, v. B. C. R. & N., petition to reopen.....	1890	875
River Junction, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N., telegraph operator.....	1899	33
Robbins, R. E., Herndon, v. C. M. & St. P., for freight house.....	1893	215
Root's Siding, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N., depot.....	1898	61
Roybar, F., Valeria, v. C. B. & Q., for platform.....	1889	1071
Russell, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., for night service.....	1886	506
Ruthven, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., for removal of.....	1886	561
Sandusky, citizens of, v. St. L., K. C. & N. W., for rebuilding.....	1890	999
Schell, John W. et al., Graham, v. B. C. R. & N., shipping facilities.....	1892	734
Seever, W. A. et al., Oskaloosa, v. Central Iowa, accommodations.....	1886	520
Sheldon, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., inadequate.....	1887	697
Shipley Bros., Herndon, v. O. M. & St. P., insufficient approaches.....	1885	525
Showman, William et al., Showman, v. C. M. & St. P., for restoration of.....	1890	917
Slater, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W., petition for billing.....	1888	689
Snyder, A. B. et al., Spaulding, v. C. B. & Q., for reopening.....	1891	747
Solomon, citizens of, v. O. & St. L., petition for.....	1892	757
Springer, C. H., Springer, v. Ill. Cent., at Stacyville Jet.....	1898	59
Sumner, depot facilities furnished by O. G. W. Ry. Co.....	1899	115
Thornton, citizens of, v. M. C. & Ft. D., petition for depot.....	1889	981
Todd, C. J. and J. T., Diagonal, v. St. P. & K. C. facilities.....	1892	828
Udell, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., establishment of.....	1894	162
Ulster, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1890	855
Van Saun, George B., Cedar Falls, v. C. G. W., opening of.....	1894	285
Warner, W. F., Luana, v. C. M. & St. P., insufficient depot grounds.....	1897	53
Watts, Fremont, Goose Lake, v. C. & N.-W., shipping facilities.....	1890	947
Westfield, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for.....	1890	919
Westfield, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., amended decision.....	1891	802
Williams, citizens of, v. Ill. Cent., for night mail service.....	1888	712
Wilson, G. M. et al., Ira, v. C. G. W., insufficient.....	1893	150
Wilson, J. S., Hill's Siding, v. B. C. R. & N., petition for.....	1892, 735	1893
Wisdom, F., Creston, v. C. B. & Q. et al., additional at Afton Junction.....	1897	101
Wright, A. G. et al., Whiting, v. S. C. & P., for night service.....	1886	512
Young, James & Co., Sidney, v. C. B. & Q., negligence of agent.....	1894	307
STATISTICS, difficulty in obtaining.....	1897, 4	1899
STATUTES RELATING TO RAILWAYS—see <i>Laws</i> .		
STEALING LIVE STOCK IN TRANSIT—see <i>Substitution of Live Stock, etc.</i>		
STEEL RAILS, introduction of, duty on, etc.....	1880	183
STOCK, CAPITAL—see <i>Capital Stock</i> .		
STOCK CATTLE, PETITION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF RATES ON—see <i>Rates</i> .		
STOCK CATTLE, REDUCED RATES FOR ROUND TRIP SHIPMENTS OF—see <i>Rates</i> .		
STOCK AND DEBT, per mile.....	1880	157
STOCKHOLDERS, LISTS OF.....	1888	650-657

STOCK KILLED AND INJURED—see, also, <i>Damages</i> .	Year	Page
Bailey, J. S., Searsboro, v. Cent. Iowa, at crossing, failure to whistle.....	1888	669
Bantes, L., Weldon, v. K. & W., on crossing.....	1892	844
Bates, L. P., Russell, v. W., St. L. & P. et al., failure to fence.....	1886	603
Barkley, E. A., Odebolt, v. C. & N.-W., by train.....	1895	165
Beyers, Mrs. J. W., Hull, v. C. M. & St. P., on private crossing.....	1898	69
Blanchard, John, Blencoe, v. S. C. & P., on crossing.....	1887	739
Boatwright, D. J., Hastie, v. Wabash, hogs on account of defective fence.....	1892	865
Bruntzing, A. E., Hull, v. C. M. & St. P., on open farm crossing.....	1898	82
Butin, D. F., Des Moines, v. C. M. & St. P., damages for.....	1888	685
Campbell, F. R., Bismarck, v. C. M. & St. P., calf.....	1898	69
Condit, A. B., Paton, v. C. R. I. & P., at cattle guard.....	1888	828
Cowry, Patrick, Paton, v. C. R. I. & P., near station.....	1889	746
Decker, J. I., East Peru, v. C. St. P. & K. C., by train.....	1890	866
Dickman, John, Westgate, v. C. St. P. & K. C., at crossing.....	1889	104
Dooler, W. L., Vall, v. C. & N.-W., defective fence.....	1898	657
Earle, W. C., Waukon, v. C. M. & St. P., hogs in transit.....	1888	735
Emery, H. A., Thayer, v. C. B. & Q.....	1889	240
Ferguson, J. A., Paton, v. C. R. I. & P., cow.....	1889	1045
Fowler, F. H., Cedar Rapids, v. B. C. R. & N., failure to whistle and ring.....	1892	851
Fraser, W. W., Bevington, v. C. R. I. & P., on depot grounds.....	1888	743-744
Fraser, J., Paullina, v. C. & N.-W.....	1895	170
Frazier, Geo., Panora, v. D. M. N. & W., defective cattle guards.....	1897	110
Gould, M., Van Wert, v. H. & S., struck by engine.....	1890	845
Gruwell, E. T., West Branch, v. B. C. R. & N., claim for.....	1889	1058
Helmer, M. F., Mechanicsville, v. C. & N.-W., on right of way.....	1884	622
Harris, H. W., Perry, v. D. M. & Ft. D. Rd., on highway crossing.....	1883	694
Harris, John, Oswalt, v. Iowa Northern, claim for on crossing.....	1892	826
Hibbard, A. A., Paullina, v. C. & N.-W., calf.....	1886, 586	1894
Hibbard, A. A., Paullina, v. C. & N.-W., hogs.....	1889, 1060	1895
Ives, Julius, Dickens, v. C. M. & St. P., damage for.....	1889	1025
Leeper, J. W., Truro, v. D. M. & K. C., injured in cattle guard.....	1892	826
Logan, Mrs. R. E., Rhodes, v. C. M. & St. P., on account of defective fence.....	1892	843
Mackinnon, J. C., Gen. Mgr. O. F. M. & D. M., inquiry as to liability.....	1893	249
March, C. H., Grinnell, v. Cent. Iowa, at crossing, failure to whistle.....	1888	680
Mayhew, N. P., Villisca, v. C. B. & Q., in transit.....	1885	547
McCahall, M., et al., Conger, v. C. St. P. & K. C., claim for.....	1891	818
McCracken, Mrs. E., Thornburg, v. B. C. R. & N., failure to fence.....	1892	866
McCracken, Mrs. E., Thornburg, v. B. C. R. & N., claim for.....	1893	218
McWilliams, H., Denison, v. C. & N.-W., claim for.....	1890	914
Peter, John, Paullina, v. C. & N.-W., claim for.....	1892	830
Raybourne, A., Woodward, v. D. M. & Northern, claim for.....	1891	778
Remington Bros., Murray, v. C. B. & Q., on crossing.....	1898	67
Richards, W., Davis City, v. C. B. & Q., claim for.....	1892	831
Roberts, Anthony, Van Wert, v. K. & W., hog, on depot grounds.....	1888	714
Rohmer, J., Paullina, v. C. & N.-W., claim for.....	1887	680
Rudabaugh, C. S., Davis City, v. C. B. & Q., claim for.....	1892	823
Shay, John, Maloy, v. C. St. P. & K. C., claim for.....	1893	230
Smith, J. J., West Branch, v. B. O. R. & N., cow.....	1898	68
Stout, J. C., Thayer, v. C. B. & Q.....	1895	208
Tallman, J. A., Paton, v. C. R. I. & P., on station grounds.....	1889	1068
Tasker Bros., Onslow, v. C. & N.-W.....	1885	546
Waggoner, Henry, Odebolt, v. C. & N.-W.....	1894	306
Week, C. F., Clefmont, v. B. C. R. & N., damages for.....	1886	510
White, S. J., Plymouth, v. C. M. & St. P., account of defective fence.....	1892	848
Wilson, E. C., Van Wert, v. H. & S., injured on bridge.....	1888	682
STOCK IN TRANSIT, DAMAGE TO—see <i>Damages</i> .		
STOCK WATERING. Hepburn Committee Report.....	1890	178
STOCK WATERING—see <i>Watering Stock</i> .		



	Year	Page
<b>STOCK YARDS.</b>		
Calloway, Dr. P., Atlantic, v. C., R. I. & P., discrimination in privileges	1895	233
Conger, B. F., Woodward, v. C. M. & St. P., discrimination in privileges	1894	345
Conover, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., lack of water at	1895	135
Coon Rapids, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., condition of	1896	53
Leverton, John, Abbott, v. Iowa Cent., condition of	1899	99
Marcus, city of, v. Ill. Cent., removal of	1897	123
McCullough & Fudge, Marne, v. C. R. I. & P., lack of water in	1897	132
Meehan, P. F., and William Drew, Clayton, v. C. B. & Q., petition for	1894	291
Reynolds, J. J. et al., Blencoe, v. S. C. & P., petition for	1888	711
Ridgeway, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., lack of water, etc.	1898	75
Shannon City, Ewing, J. K., of, v. C. G. W., condition of stock yards	1896	51
Vincent, J. F., prop. union stock yards, Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to deliver cars	1896	105
STONE SHIPMENTS, regulations concerning	1892	860
STOPPING FAST TRAINS AT SMALL STATIONS—see <i>Train Service</i> .		
STOPPING THE RUNNING OF TRAINS, power of the commissioners in, when road is declared unsafe	1892	766
STOP-OVER CHECKS AND PRIVILEGES—see, also, <i>Passenger Fare</i> .	1893	861
STOPPING TRAINS AT PLATFORMS	1899	987
Beck, W. J. R., Ft. Madison, v. St. L., K. & N. W., stopping caboose at platform	1897	89
McGuire, E. H., Marengo, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal to	1890	907
Selma, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., caboose, liability of carriers	1891	776
STOPPING TRAINS AT RAILROAD CROSSINGS—see <i>Crossing Stops</i> .		
STORAGE, USE OF CARS FOR WAREHOUSE PURPOSES—see <i>Demurrage</i> .		
STORAGE, CHARGES FOR—see <i>Baggage</i> .		
STREET CROSSING, BLOCKADING OF WITH TRAINS—see <i>Obstructing of Streets</i> .		
STREET CROSSINGS, ESTABLISHMENT OF—see <i>Crossings, Highway</i> .		
<b>STRIKES.</b>		
Employment of incompetent engineers on C. B. & Q.	1887	787
Discussion and effect of	1888, 44; 1889	33
Delay of freight on account of—see <i>Delay in Transit</i> .		
<b>SUBSTITUTION.</b>		
Wilson, A. R., Traer, v. C. & N.-W., of light for heavy steer	1888	723
SUNDAY TRAINS.		
Discussed, recommendations concerning, etc.	1889, 81; 1894, 42; 1895, 96; 1896	59
<b>SUPREME COURT OPINION.</b>		
Algona Y case, defining discretion of commissioners in ordering "Y"	1892	896
Carpenter, D. J., Beloit, v. C. M. & St. P., what constitutes state commerce	1892	901
Cutler, G. L., Clarion, under farm crossing	1892	889
Ft. Dodge, v. C. R. I. & P. et al., rebuilding of Tara track	1892	879
McDonald, Thomas, Bayard, under farm crossing case	1892	893
Sunny Hill Alliance, Hartley, asking for site for coal house	1892	903
SUPREME COURT, decision of in reference to orders of railroad commissioners discussed	1892	21-39
Decisions of in Granger cases	1878	55
<b>SWITCH TRACK—see <i>Spur Track</i>.</b>		
SWITCH, definition of, what constitutes	1890, 901, 922; 1891, 792; 1892, 708; 1894	310
<b>SWITCHES, INTERLOCKING—see <i>Interlocking Switches</i>.</b>		
<b>SWITCHING.</b>		
Charges for	1895	217
Legislation recommended	1899, 38; 1891	43
Less rate for greater number of cars switched	1888	697
Regulations of commissioners concerning	1891	862
Schedule for, in Dubuque case established	1887, 749; 1889, 1034-1036	
<b>COMPLAINTS CONCERNING.</b>		
Advance Thresher Co. v. C. & N.-W., refusal	1891	768
Aultman, C. & Co., Cedar Rapids, v. C. & N.-W., refusal and discrimination	1893	206
Bannister Bros., Clinton, v. C. M. & St. P., refusal, car of wheat	1891	778
Bigelow Bros., New Hampton, v. C. G. W., refusal	1894	281
Cathcart & Woodruff, Correctionville, v. Ill. Central et al.	1894, 350; 1898	81
C., Ft. M. & D. M. R'y Co. v. St. L., K. & N. W. R'y Co., exorbitant	1894	356

**SWITCHING—continued—**

	Year	Page
Conant, Homer, Sheldon, v. Illinois Central et al., refusal	1894	339
Corey Coal Co., Lehigh, v. Crooked Creek	1898	16
Council Bluffs Water Works Co. v. C. & N.-W., excessive	1888	667
Cunningham, T. A., Clare, v. C. R. I. & P. et al., excessive	1890	880
Cunningham, T. A., Clare, v. C. B. & Q. and C. R. I. & P., rehearing	1891	800
Day & Sons, Minneapolis, v. Illinois Central, unreasonable charges for	1886	490
Deaf Institute, Council Bluffs, v. C. R. I. & P., excessive	1891	792
Des Moines Linsed Oil Co. v. C. M. & St. P., refusal to	1897	152
Des Moines Northern & Western R'y Co. v. C. & N.-W.	1895	229
Des Moines Oil Tank Line Co. v. C. & N.-W., refusal, tank cars	1888	887
Des Moines Street R. Co. v. C. & N.-W., exorbitant charges, rate fixed	1892	790
Dubuque Board of Trade v. Illinois Central et al., refusal to	1887	743
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Dey	1887	749
Dubuque, fuel oil switching case	1889	1032
Farmington Coal and Mining Co. v. C. R. I. & P., charges	1894	308
Firmenich Mfg. Co., Marshalltown, v. Iowa Cent. and C. & N.-W., refusal	1890	868
Gould, E. E., Goldfield, v. B. C. R. & N., failure	1882	598
Hambleton Milling Co., Keokuk, v. C. R. I. & P., discrimination	1894	338
Hampton Milling Co., Hampton, v. Iowa Central, refusal	1890	867
Heath, H. R. & Sons, Ft. Dodge, v. Ill. Cent., discrimination	1894	164
Heath, H. R. & Sons, Fort Dodge, v. M. & St. L. at Sheldon	1897	60
Heaton Fuel Co., Council Bluffs, C. & N.-W., excessive charges	1888	667
Jones county, supervisors of, v. C. & N.-W.	1888	675
Keokuk & W. R. R. Co. v. St. L., K. & N. W. et al., exorbitant charges	1889	994
K. & W. R'd Co. v. C. R. I. & P., refusal at Bevington	1899	76
Lane, H. D. & Co., Tama, v. C. M. & St. P., exorbitant rate	1892	854
Little, E. J., Lima, Ohio, v. C. M. & St. P., refusal, cars of oil at Dubuque	1889, 1032, 1036	
Lyons Paper Mill Co. v. C. & N.-W., excessive rates on coal	1892	865
Malden, T. E., Manson, v. Ill. Cent., exorbitant charges	1881	131
Miller, A. H., Melbourne, v. C. M. & St. P., refusal to	1893	216
Niver Iron Works, Muscatine, v. B. C. R. & N.	1890	82
Norwegian Plow Co., Dubuque, v. Ill. Cent., refusal to	1889	1087
Oskaloosa Water Co., Oskaloosa, v. Central Iowa, excessive rates for	1886	590
Ottumwa Iron Works v. C. R. I. & P., excessive charges on coal	1891	757
Randall & Dickey, Des Moines, v. C. & N.-W., refusal cars of implements	1892	837
Scott, B. P., Goldfield, v. B. C. R. & N., refusal	1898	54
Southside Ice Co., Centerville, inquiry concerning	1893	51
Sweezy & Borman, Newell, v. Ill. Cent., excessive rates	1883	539
Talbot, D. H., Sioux City, v. C. M. & St. P., et al., excessive charges	1890	884
Thompson, Watson, Clinton, v. C. & N.-W., refusal to	1888	668
Townsend, E., Cedar Falls, v. Ill. Cent., overcharge	1881	142
Townsend, J. W., Keokuk, v. C. R. I. & P., discrimination in	1894	253
Vincent, J. F., Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., cars to Union stockyards	1896	105
Western White Bronze Co., Des Moines, v. C. R. I. & P., refusal	1895	192
Wisconsin, Iowa & Nebraska R'y Co. v. C. & N.-W., refusal to	1884	530
Wisconsin, Iowa & Nebraska v. Iowa Northern, refusal to, and forward	1886	559
Wolf, P. A., Cedar Rapids, v. C. & N.-W., refusal to	1893	254
Wylie, J. S., Davenport, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive charges	1890, 901, 920	

**TAKING UP TRACK—see *Abandonment of Road*.**

	Year	Page
<b>TARIFFS.</b>		
Posting of, legislation recommended	1890	42
Ruling of board, concerning posting of	1889	1099
<b>TARIFF, GRANGER—see <i>Granger Tariff</i>.</b>		
<b>TAXES, TAXATION AND TAX AID.</b>		
Discussion of law concerning	1884	82
In aid of railroads, discussed	1884	82
In aid of railroads to secure stations—see <i>Stations</i> .		
Rich, Geo. L., Fort Dodge, v. Ft. Dodge & Ft. Ridgely and M. & St. L. Rys.	1883	590
Returns to be made to railroad commissioners	1878	38
Taxation of railroad property	1878	69
Taxation of railroads discussed	1886	14



## TERMINAL CHARGES—

Huse, S. E., Coon Rapids, v. C. M. & St. P., excessive on short haul of coal.....	1887	722
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Dey.....	1887	723
Petition for establishment of at 1 cent per hundred.....	1889	1024

TERMINAL CHARGES—see *Miscellaneous*; also *Rates*.

## TERRITORY, DIVISION OF, BETWEEN RAILS—

THROUGH BILLING—	1889	1022, 1027
------------------	------	------------

Davenport, shippers of, v. B. C. R. & N. et al., West Liberty.....	1890	24
--	------	----

THROUGH RATES, FREIGHTAGE OF, allowed to local lines.....	1893	24
---	------	----

THROUGH TRAIN SERVICE—see <i>Train Service</i> .		
--	--	--

TICKETS—		
----------	--	--

Bogart, George, Shenandoah, v. C. R. I. & P., in honoring round-trip tickets.....	1890	929
---	------	-----

Burns, Thomas, Breda, v. C. & N.-W., refund paid for but not issued.....	1893	216
--	------	-----

Byram, M. W., Fremont, v. Iowa Cent., discrimination in sale of round-trip.....	1891	737
---	------	-----

Discrimination in sale of—see <i>Discrimination</i> .		
---	--	--

Grissell, A. H., Menlo, v. C. R. I. & P., regulations concerning, limited.....	1890	936
--	------	-----

THIS RATE—see <i>Rates</i> .		
------------------------------	--	--

TIME FOR LOADING AND UNLOADING CARS—see <i>Demurrage</i> .		
--	--	--

TOLL BRIDGE, ABSORPTION OF—see <i>Bridge Toll</i> .		
---	--	--

TONNAGE—		
----------	--	--

Earnings, on state and interstate, decrease in for 1894, compared with 1893.....	1894	215
--	------	-----

East and west compared.....	1873	54
-----------------------------	------	----

From point to point in Iowa as compared with total Iowa tonnage.....	1892	15-30
--	------	-------

Failure of companies to report commodity.....	1873	61
---	------	----

Failure to separate for different states.....	1873	62
---	------	----

In carloads and less than carloads, comparative amount in car.....	1893	33
--	------	----

In Iowa, increase of.....	1890, 26	191
---------------------------	----------	-----

In Iowa, has reached its maximum.....	1883	32
---------------------------------------	------	----

Local freight, percentage of in Iowa.....	1884	31
---	------	----

Percentage of.....	1883	23
--------------------	------	----

TOOL CHESTS, MECHANICS', TRANSPORTATION OF AS BAGGAGE—see <i>Baggage</i> .		
--	--	--

TOPOGRAPHICAL—Discussion of elevation of railroads.....	1879	59-63
---	------	-------

TRACKS, SPUR, COMPULSORY OPERATION OF—see <i>Spur Tracks</i> .		
--	--	--

TRACK, TAKING UP—see <i>Abandonment of Road</i> .		
---	--	--

TRACK CLOSING—		
----------------	--	--

Calloway, Dr. P., Atlantic, v. C. R. I. & P.....	1895	233
--	------	-----

For weighing grain and live stock.....	1895	xxvii
--	------	-------

Sanders, W. B., Rolfe, v. C. & N.-W., conditions necessary for securing.....	1892	551
--	------	-----

TRAFFIC POOLING—see <i>Pooling</i> .		
--------------------------------------	--	--

TRAFFIC BLOCKING STREETS—see <i>Obstructing Streets</i> .		
---	--	--

TRAIN CONNECTION—see <i>Train Service</i> .		
---	--	--

TRAINS CARRYING PASSENGERS TO BE STOPPED AT PLATFORM—see, also, <i>Stopping Trains at Platforms</i> .		
---	--	--

TRAINS, SPEED OF—see <i>Speed of Trains</i> .....	1889	987, 1087
---	------	-----------

TRAIN SERVICE—see, also, <i>Stopping Trains at Platforms</i> .		
--	--	--

Carriers required to furnish adequate and reasonable facilities.....	1891	810
--	------	-----

Obligation to furnish first-class service in consideration of aid received.....	1889	1007
---	------	------

Restoration of on branch lines.....	1898	10
-------------------------------------	------	----

Should be so arranged as to carry passengers to principal towns in forenoons and return in the afternoon.....	1891	706, 510
---	------	----------

Discussion of through passenger and freight service.....	1898	6
--	------	---

Discussion of stopping fast trains at small stations.....	1899	9
---	------	---

TRAIN SERVICE, COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—		
---------------------------------------	--	--

Atton, citizens of, v. C. G. W., insufficient mail service at Talmage.....	1896	36
--	------	----

Albia, citizens of, v. Central Iowa, insufficient number of trains.....	1883	586
---	------	-----

Alden, F. E. Furry, v. Illinois Cent., stopping fast train.....	1896	94
---	------	----

Allen, J. F. Vinton, v. C. M. & St. P., petition for additional.....	1889	1081
--	------	------

Aplington, citizens of, v. Illinois Central, re-establishment of night service, etc.....	1893, 219; 1896, 88; 1899	38
--	---------------------------	----

Atalissa, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., stopping through trains.....	1897	73
---	------	----

Aurora, citizens of, by H. J. Griswold, Winthrop, v. C. G. W., better mail.....	1894	1013
---	------	------

Bayless, F. D., Elkader, v. C. M. & St. P., insufficient.....	1891	1013
---	------	------

Beck, W. J. R., Ft. Madison, v. St. L., K. & N. W., insufficient.....	1899	79
---	------	----

## TRAIN SERVICE—COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—continued—

Cascade, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., inadequate freight train service.....	1896	85
--	------	----

Coin, W. E., Adair, v. C. O. & St. L., stopping fast train.....	1895	713
---	------	-----

Cone, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N., stopping additional trains.....	1889	1014
--	------	------

Conger, Jas., Des Moines, v. C. M. & St. P., insufficient.....	1890	118
--	------	-----

Corning, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., stopping trains.....	1891, 738; 1893	300
---	-----------------	-----

Coxler, B. F. W., Indianola, v. C. & N.-W. et al., connection at Sheldahl.....	1887	727
--	------	-----

Cumming, citizens of, v. C. G. W., additional train service.....	1896	134
--	------	-----

Dashiell, M. A. et al., Indianola, v. C. R. I. & P.....	1892	839
---	------	-----

Davis, W. J., Harlan, v. C. R. I. & P., withdrawal of, on branch lines.....	1889	1008
---	------	------

Defiance, citizens of, et al., v. C. M. & St. P., additional train.....	1896	116
---	------	-----

De Buse, M. B., Wota, mail service.....	1892	94
---	------	----

De Stott, Earlham, Dexter, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., additional.....	1897	61
---	------	----

Denison, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W., petition to stop fast train.....	1892	733
---	------	-----

Dunsmore, N. Rockwell, v. Central Iowa, failure to stop at stations, etc.....	1892	339
---	------	-----

Earlham, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., petition to stop additional trains.....	1888	519
---	------	-----

Elkader, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., on branch line.....	1897	97
--	------	----

Falkenhamer, Geo., Vinton, v. B. C. R. & N.....	1898	56
---	------	----

Forbes, Frank, Osage, v. C. M. & St. P. et al., train connections.....	1898	654
--	------	-----

Green Bros. et al., East Peru, v. C. G. W., insufficient freight.....	1895	119
---	------	-----

Greenfield, Orient, Bridgewater, Pontanelle and Massena, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., additional train service for branch line.....	1891	763
--	------	-----

Hancock, J. T. & Sons, Dubuque, v. C. G. W., passenger.....	1895	171
---	------	-----

Hosper, citizens of, v. C. St. P., M. & O., petition for night train service.....	1896	16
---	------	----

Hoyt, O. N., Green Mountain, v. C. G. W., stopping train on signal train service.....	1897	116
---	------	-----

Hammer, George, Mercantile Co., Iowa City, v. C. R. I. & P., insufficient.....	1894	316
--	------	-----

Jenison, E. M., Ottumwa, v. Wabash et al., between Ottumwa and Des Moines.....	1895	180
--	------	-----

Jones, O. D., Independence, v. C. R. I. & P. and Ill. Cent., insufficient.....	1894	301
--	------	-----

Keosauqua, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., petition for.....	1890	875
---	------	-----

Kirkpatrick, J. W., Wyoming, v. C. & N.-W., carrying passengers on freight trains.....	1897	151
--	------	-----

Knowles, W. F., James, v. C. St. P., M. & O., petition for local.....	1893	138
---	------	-----

Knowles, W. F., James, v. Ill. Cent. et al., La Mars to Sioux City.....	1885	572
---	------	-----

Latty, citizens of, v. B. C. R. & N., passenger train.....	1887	688
--	------	-----

Leimkueller, Frank, Moscow, v. C. R. I. & P., additional trains.....	1893	217
--	------	-----

Marble Rock, F. E. Gates, mayor of, v. B. C. R. & N., stopping train at small station.....	1898	96
--	------	----

Masonville, J. W., Tarley of, v. Ill. Cent., stopping through train.....	1896	45
--	------	----

McCauley, John P., Buade et al., of, Iowa Central, branch train service.....	1891	61
--	------	----

McDonald, D. J. et al., Arcadia, v. C. & N.-W., insufficient.....	1884	517
---	------	-----

Milo, Lacona, Ackworth, Charlton, v. C. B. & Q.....	1896	164
---	------	-----

Mt. Ayr and citizens of Ringgold county v. C. B. & Q., inadequate.....	1889	1004
--	------	------

Dissenting opinion of Commissioner Dey.....	1889	1008
---	------	------

Mt. Ayr, citizens of, v. C. B. & Q., letter from attorney-general concerning.....	1893	242
---	------	-----

Murphy, D. D., Elkader, v. C. M. & St. P., improved.....	1892	864
--	------	-----

Nams and Centerville, citizens of, v. C. R. I. & P., additional.....	1891	781
--	------	-----

Olinger, William, Thayer, v. C. B. & Q., additional.....	1894	265
--	------	-----

Panama and Persia et al., citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., additional.....	1892	783
---	------	-----

Persia, citizens of, et al., v. C. M. & St. P., additional.....	1892	783
---	------	-----

Pleasanton, citizens of, v. D. M. & K. C., additional.....	1893	139
--	------	-----

Prinly, H. C., Center Point, v. B. C. R. & N., additional.....	1892	742
--	------	-----

Raynard, Joseph S. et al., Oreston, v. C. St. P. & K. C. and C. B. & Q., additional.....	1892	742
--	------	-----

Rional at Afton Junction.....	1892, 739; 1893	136
-------------------------------	-----------------	-----

Ruchte, A., Dubuque, v. C. M. & St. P., on Volga branch.....	1898	40
--	------	----

Rudd, citizens of, v. C. M. & St. P., stopping fast train, 1894, 177; rehearing.....	1895	115
--	------	-----

Sandusky, citizens of, v. St. L., K. & N. W., stopping fast train.....	1894	296
--	------	-----

Santiago and Berwick, citizens of, v. C. St. P. & K. C., additional.....	1892	787
--	------	-----

Scott, J. H., Mediapolis, v. B. & N. W., train to carry passengers.....	1892	849
---	------	-----

Seamans, H. W., Clinton, v. B. C. R. & N., insufficient.....	1890	945
--	------	-----

Shannon City, J. K. Ewing et al., of, v. C. G. W., stopping fast train.....	1892	50
---	------	----

Sloan, citizens of, v. S. C. & P., additional.....	1889	1072
--	------	------



	Year	Page
<b>TRAIN SERVICE—COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—continued—</b>		
Smoke, D. H. et al., Durant, v. C., R. I. & P., insufficient	1896	146
Strahan, citizens of, v. C. & St. L., stopping fast train at	1899	78
Talmage, citizens of, v. C. G. W., insufficient mail service	1896	36
Tiffin and 16 other cities and towns on C., R. I. & P., additional	1891	803
Turkey River Branch C., M. & St. P.	1898	20
Volga Branch C., M. & St. P.	1898	20
Waterloo, train connection at	1899	75
Waukon, citizens of, v. C., M. & St. P., additional	1892	732
Wehde, D. C., Berwick, v. C. G. W., stopping certain train	1896	130
Weihle, Wm. E., v. C., M. & St. P., from McGregor	1885	508
Westgate, R. R., Robinson of, v. C. G. W., stopping fast train	1896	22
White, George F., Low Moor, v. C. & N.-W., additional	1889	1087
Whiting, city of, v. S. C. & P., stopping fast train	1896	43
Whitmore, Frank, Osceola, v. C., B. & Q., insufficient passenger	1887	708
Whitney, W. C., Whiting, v. S. C. & P., stopping trains	1896	80
Wilson, F. M., Templeton, v. C., M. & St. P., stopping of "flyer"	1893, 243	179
Yorkshire, citizens of, et al., v. C., M. & St. P., additional	1892	783
YORKSHIRE, citizens of, et al., v. C., M. & St. P., additional	1878	45
<b>TRAMPS</b>		
<b>TRANSFER AND TRANSFER FACILITIES, CHARGES, ETC.—see, also, Wyes.</b>		
Baggage, passenger or freight, discussion of law concerning	1884	78-79
Fogg, J. Leland, Cedar Rapids, v. C., M. & St. P., et al., charges	1892	846
Fayette county, citizens of, v. C., M. & St. P., at Donnan Junction	1887	705
Harris & Cole Bros., Cedar Falls, v. C. & N.-W., Ill. Cent., C., B. & Q., C., St. P. & K. C. and H. & S., petition for transfer for less than carload freight in O'Brien county, near Afton, and in Ringgold county	1889	998
Lieser, I. M., Abbott, v. B. C. R. & N., failure to furnish	1880	136
Louden Machinery company, Fairfield, v. C., B. & Q. and C. G. W. at Afton	1893	167
Miller, Jay D., Ida Grove, v. C., M. & St. P. et al., petition for at crossing	1887	785
Nelson, Oley et al., v. C., & N.-W. and C., M. & St. P., at Sheldahl	1883	686
Reynard, J. S., Creston, v. C., B. & Q. and C. G. W., at Afton Junction	1893	136
Rodifer, J. W., Council Bluffs, v. C. & N.-W., protest against requiring transfer of coal at Junction	1879	39
Waldo & Thornley, Woodward, v. C., R. I. & P. et al., at Junction	1897	122
<b>TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FOR COAL—see, also, Failure to Furnish Cars.</b>		
<b>TRANSPORTATION FREIGHT—see Refusal to Receive and Forward Freight.</b>		
<b>TRANSPORTATION FREE FOR COMMISSIONERS AND SECRETARY, see, also, Laws.</b>		
TRAVELING MEN'S SAMPLE CASES—see Baggage.		
TRESPASSING ON TRACK, DANGER OF	1891	841
TUCKER, HORACE, G. F. A. Ill. Cent., on reduction of Iowa corn rates.	1886	621
<b>UNDER CROSSING—see Crossing.</b>		
<b>UNIFORMITY OF RAILROAD ACCOUNTS—see Accounts.</b>		
UNIFORM CLASSIFICATION, discussed	1887	4
<b>UNION DEPOTS—see, also, Stations and Joint Stations.</b>		
At Junction points, discussed and recommended	1894, 42, 78,	82
Discussion of, by L. S. Coffin	1883	89
Liabilities of companies using same	1884	82
Legislation recommended	1889, 40;	1891 44
<b>COMPLAINTS CONCERNING.</b>		
Adams county, citizens of, v. C., St. P. & K. C. et al., petition, near Afton	1888	747
Council Bluffs, city of, v. all entering railways, petition for	1892	809
Council Bluffs, citizens of, various lines, petition for	1886	570
Des Moines, unsafe condition of	1898	11
Harrison Twp., Mahaska Co., citizens of, v. B. & W. and C. & N.-W., petition	1887	764
Keokuk, city of, v. C., R. I. & P. et al., petition for	1886	612
Dissenting opinion by Commissioner Coffin	1886	617
Ledyard v. B. C. R. & N. and C. & N.-W.	1898	38
Morning Sun, citizens, v. B., C. R. & N. et al., petition for	1888	726
Ottumwa case	1887	699
Wheatland case	1887	756
UNIT OF RATES, the car load—see, also, Car Load Rates.	1880	182

UNJUST DISCRIMINATION—see Discrimination.

UNSAFE CONDITION OF BRIDGE—see Bridges, Unsafe Condition of.

UNSAFE CONDITION OF ROAD.

	Year	Page
Barnes, A. R., Albia, v. Albia & Cent.	1892	739
Bristow, citizens of, v. C. G. W., of Sumner & Hampton branch	1892	764
Cochran, M., Oasis, v. B. C. R. & N.	1881	134
Edwards, N. W., Moulton, v. St. L., K. C. & N.	1880	64
Employees, committee of, v. O. & St. L.	1892	753
Hotchkiss, A. C., Adel, v. D. M. & N. W.	1892	848
Kasson, L. J., Des Moines, v. Iowa Cent.	1886	553
Sumner & Hampton branch on C. G. W.	1892	834

## VALUE.

Actual present cash, of road and equipment, letters concerning	1887	131-147
Letter of W. G. Purdy, vice-president C., R. I. & P. R'y Co., and discussion	1888	41, 44-45
Present cash, of railroad property	1888	661
Of railroads as compared with other property	1878	66

## VIADUCTS—

City council, by laws of Iowa, given full control and jurisdiction over the streets, alleys and public grounds of the city	1893	152
Commissioners have no authority to order, where no street exists	1892	777
Conditions of in various cities	1894	150
Expense not a factor in protecting life at crossings	1886	566
Jurisdiction of commissioners over, appellate of supervisory in its nature	1893	152
Objections of abutting property owners relatively unimportant as bearing upon the public safety and convenience	1893	153
Plans for construction must provide for closing street over railroad	1894	156
Rights of public to viaduct, expense not to be considered	1886	566

## COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—

Cedar Rapids, city of, v. B. C. R. & N. et al., petition for across Avenue A	1888	742
Cedar Rapids, city of, v. various railways, petition for	1891	801
Davenport, Charles Francis, engineer, v. C., M. & St. P., petition for	1894	304
Davenport, city of, v. C., M. & St. P.	1890	71
Des Moines, Iowa, in matter of, on Ninth street	1888, 735;	1894 143
Des Moines, in matter of, on Seventh street	1888	736
Des Moines, plans for, on Seventh street, approved	1889	1079
Des Moines, city of, v. various railways, petition for, on Ninth street	1893	149
Fort Dodge, city of, v. C., R. I. & P. and M. & St. L., petition for	1892	802
McGregor, city of, v. C., M. & St. P., over-crossing on highway	1889	1009
Neola, citizens of, v. C., R. I. & P. and C., M. & St. P., petition for	1892	805
Oelwein, city of, v. C. G. W., condition of	1890	81
Oskaloosa, city of, v. C., R. I. & P., petition for	1892	768
Walnut, citizens of, v. C., R. I. & P., petition for overhead crossing	1889	979

VIOLATION OF CONTRACT—see Contract.

## WAREHOUSE SITES—see Sites.

WAREHOUSES, PUBLIC, should be established

WAREHOUSE, USE OF CARS FOR—see Demurrage.

WARMING CARS—Discussion of

WARS, RATE—see Rate Wars.

WATER, OVERFLOW, DRAINAGE, BACK WATER, ETC.—see Overflow, Drainage.

WATER ROUTES for east-bound freights, effects on rates

WATERED STOCK—see, also, Capitalization and Stock Watering.

Discussion of

Earnings of, 1874 to 1888

Increase of, by C., R. I. &amp; P.

Increase of, by C., B. &amp; Q.

Legislative control in issuance of

WATERWAY, OBSTRUCTION OF—see Obstruction and Overflow.

WATT, JAMES, letter of, on maintenance of carload rates

WEIGHING ASSOCIATION, WESTERN, rules to govern shipments



	Year	Page
WEIGHTS, ESTIMATED—see <i>Minimum Weights</i> .		
WHISTLING AT HIGHWAY CROSSINGS—see <i>Stock Killed, Crossing, Highway</i> .		
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL RATES—see, also, <i>Car Load Rates</i> .	1880	182
WHOLESALE HOUSES, NUMBER IN IOWA—see <i>Jobbers</i> .		
WICKER, H. C., traffic manager C. & N.-W., on reduction of Iowa corn rates.	1886	621
WYES—		
Discussion and legislation recommended.	1889	40
Laws concerning, imperative and compulsory.	1882, 429, 1887	754
Legislation recommended.	1891	44
Will not be ordered unless required for commercial reasons.	1893	171
COMPLAINTS CONCERNING—		
Adams county, citizens of, v. C., B. & Q., petition for near Afton.	1888	747
Algona, citizens of, v. C., M. & St. P., petition for.	1889 1056-1058	
Algona, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W. et al., petition for.	1890	843
Atwood, What Cheer Stove Co., v. C., R. I. & P. et al., petition for.	1897	139
Bevington, D. M. & K. O. v. C., R. I. & P.	1897	20
Billings, E., Ogden, v. M. & St. L. and C. & N.-W., at Ogden.	1882	556
Brown, M. C. et al., Waterloo, v. C. G. W. et al.	1897	30
Budd, H. J., Knoxville, v. C. & N.-W. and C., B. & Q., transfer track.	1884	580
Burt, C. J., Dubuque, v. C., M. & St. P. and C. & N.-W., at Clinton.	1882	539
Carnforth, What Cheer Stove Co., v. C., R. I. & P. et al.	1897	139
Central Iowa Coal Co., Des Moines, v. D. M. & Ft. D. et al., petition for.	1884	514
Cox & Kirker, Deep River, v. C., R. I. & P. and C. & N.-W., at crossing.	1884	591
Diagonal, citizens of, v. C., St. P. & K. C. and H. & S., petition for.	1889	1083
Fayette county, citizens of, v. C., M. & St. P. et al., at Donnan Junction.	1887	705
Geddings, C. S., Kelley, v. C. & N.-W., refusal to transfer cars at Sheldahl.	1886	530
Hanna, J. Q., Goldfield, v. C. & N.-W.	1882	422
Henry, W. G., et al., Emmetsburg, v. B., C. R. & N. and C., M. & St. P.	1882	528
Lawrence, C. S., Manning, v. C. & N.-W. and C., M. & St. P.	1885	566
Lehigh, Samuel McClure, v. M. C. & Ft. D. et al.	1897	36
Leiser, I. M., Abbott, v. B., C. R. & N., petition for.	1880	136
Leiser et al., Abbott, v. B., C. R. & N. and Central Iowa, for establishment of.	1882	438
Lohrville, Patten, M. T. of, v. C. & N.-W., application for.	1896, 25; 1897	19
McCoy, H. O., Algona, v. C., M. & St. P. and C. & N.-W., at crossing.	1885	548
Miller, J. D., Ida Grove, v. C., M. & St. P. et al., petition for.	1887	755
Ossian, citizens of, v. B., C. R. & N. and C., M. & St. P., petition for.	1892	758
Richardson, G. H., Belmond, v. Central Iowa and B., C. R. & N., at crossing.	1884	579
Robinson, C. W., Dubuque, v. C. & N.-W. and Ill. Cent., at Webster City.	1882	539
Rock Rapids, citizens of, v. Ill. Cent. et al., for transfer track.	1892	782
Seymour, citizens of, v. C., M. & St. P. et al., for transfer track.	1892	738
Shannon City, citizens of, v. C. G. W.	1896	33
Smith, R. H., Holstein, v. C. & N.-W. et al., at Correctionville.	1888	683
Sutherland and Paullina, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W. et al.	1887	754
Sutherland and Paullina, citizens of, v. C. & N.-W. et al., order for.	1888	745

# Y CONNECTIONS—see *Wyes*.

Y. M. C. A. SECRETARIES, reduced rates for.	1892	854
---	------	-----